NATIONAL WEEKLY

Social Justice

Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

Royal Oak, Michigan | November 11, 1940 | Subscription: Three Dollars Per Year | 10¢

OUR NEXT WAR DEAL DUE IN THE PACIFIC

(See Story on Page 9)

A Plane to Ottawa, Secret Bomb Sights; 'Behind the Scenes'

(See Page 8)

If Constitution Goes, What Have We Left?

(Page 15)

The Real Issue: A Broadcast by Father Coughlin

COMMENT ON WORLD EVENTS ★ OUR NEW TRADE WITH SOVIET RUSSIA ★ THE CHURCH —AND THE FUTURE

Dinner Chat

Election Comment

BY ANOTHER of those exigencies of journalism that make an editor's life what it is, this edition of SOCIAL JUSTICE must go to press before the election. You readers, however, will know the results from the daily newspapers before this issue reaches you.

That is part of the price we must pay for popularity; i.e., for undertaking the weekly distribution of a national magazine of comment with our size circulation.

The situation also serves to remind us again of our mission here at SOCIAL JUSTICE.

* * *

First of all, we are not a daily newspaper — the "*why*," not the "when" of news, is our preoccupation.

If the "deadline" prevents our commenting upon the election results in this edition, it also frees us from that bane of newspaper life, the "election extra."

In countless newspaper offices all over the land, a vast army of hard-working veterans of the craft will toil "around the clock," to check on the poll returns *from every voting precinct in America.*

Few events so demonstrate the possibilities for efficiency and team work by the American press as the coverage of elections by their news departments.

One wishes that this same efficiency, and the same zeal for accuracy of fact and detail, might be carried over into the editorial writing sanctums where the product of the news writers is "interpreted."

It is with this *interpretation* of the news that SOCIAL JUSTICE is chiefly concerned; that, and the often untold story behind the incomplete or biased news as it appears in print.

* * *

The sixteen principles of social justice are still our "style book" of editorial policy.

On the positive side our mission (as we of the staff conceive it) is to weigh the gains for social justice in the world's news each week; and, on the negative side, to discover and combat the obstacles to the achievement of Christian social justice in America.

How well we do this job it is for you—the reader—to say. We appreciate and thank you for the verdict so far, and it is our earnest resolve always to be worthy of this reader confidence.

And so, SOCIAL JUSTICE reserves its comment on the results of the Presidential and Congressional elections until next week.

16 PRINCIPLES OF SOCIAL JUSTICE

Liberty of conscience and education. Just living annual wage.

Nationalization of important public resources.

Private ownership of all other property

Control of private property for public good.

Abolition of Federal Reserve Banking System and establishment of a Government-owned Central Bank

Restoration to Congress of its sole right to coin and regulate the value of money.

Cost of living maintained on an even keel.

Cost of production plus a fair profit for the farmer.

Labor's right to organize.

Recall of non-productive bonds.

Abolition of tax-exempt bonds.

Broadened base of taxation on basis of ownership and capacity to pay

Simplification of Government and lower taxes.

Conscription of wealth as well as men in event of war.

Sanctity of human rights preferred to sanctity of property with Government's chief concern for the poor.

SOCIAL JUSTICE, National Weekly. Copyrighted 1940 by the Social Justice Publishing Company, publication and editorial office, Royal Oak, Michigan. Subscription price, United States and possessions, $3.00 per year. Unless otherwise directed, all subscriptions begin with the current issue. Three weeks are required to effect change of subscriber's address. Give both old and new addresses. Entered as second class matter, March 12, 1937, at the Post Office, Royal Oak, Michigan, under the Act of March 3, 1879. E. Perrin Schwartz, Editor; Cora Quinlan, Secretary-Treasurer.

SOCIAL JUSTICE is fully protected by copyright and nothing that appears in it may be reprinted either wholly or in part, without special permission. The use of articles or quotations from SOCIAL JUSTICE for digest, advertising, promotions and stock-selling schemes is never authorized.

Vol. 6 November 11, 1940 No. 20

Boston's Birthday Ball

THE BANQUET and ball in honor of Father Coughlin's birthday, sponsored by the Social Justice Study Clubs of Metropolitan Boston, was held on October 24th at Hotel Westminster.

The Rev. Charles P. McLaughlin, C.S.S.R., gave the invocation, and an enthusiastic gathering of some 600 persons taxed the capacity of the ballroom to hear the Rev. Edward F. Brophy of Long Island, deliver a stirring address.

Father Brophy called upon Christians, both Catholic and Protestant, to unite against the forces of irreligion which are rampant in America today.

He paid a beautiful tribute to Father Coughlin's efforts to arouse the people from their apathy and save Christian culture from the inroads of atheism.

Father Brophy deplored the barring of Father Coughlin from the radio while its facilities are freely used by the enemies of religion.

The speaker urged his hearers to support SOCIAL JUSTICE National Magazine, and praised the great work of keeping this "medium of truth in circulation."

The priest also commended the Brooklyn *Tablet* for its fearless presentation of facts and urged his listeners to write to the *Pilot* to spread a knowledge of what is being done in the struggle to keep America a Christian nation.

The Rev. Frederick Pallidino spoke briefly. Dr. Palladino, a well known Methodist minister, has consistently supported Father Coughlin as an outstanding apostle of truth and Christian social justice.

Regrets were read from Father Coughlin and from Msgr. Flannagan of Boys' Town. Mrs. Clara Thayer, formerly hostess at the Shrine of the Little Flower, was an honored guest and Brother Maurice, C.S.S.R., of the Mission Church, also was present.

Entertainment and dancing concluded a successful evening.

Draft Numbers Worry Pete

HELLO, FOLKS:

Dear me — this November wether we're havin' sure gets me down. How're you standin' it? No leaves on th' trees, no sunshine t' speak uv—just cold, dank, dark days that give a fella th' jimjams not t' speak uv th' rumatiks.

I hope we soon get th' basemunt straitened out at our house so I c'n move in. It's kinda lonesome out in th' yard—even my squirrul frien's have left me. I think I've made up my mind that I deffunutly do not like this month—they c'n take it right out uv th' kalender f'r all uv me.

There, now—I feel a littul better gettin' that komplaint outta my sistum.

While I'm in a komplainin' mood I might's well get somethin' else off my chest even though I know it's not very nice to start off a visut this way. But that's th' way I am —it's a wunder I haven't been called on by th' offishuls at Washington t' serve in th' diplomatik kore th' way I c'n rub peepul th' wrong way—but when I've got somethin' on my mind, out it pops. After that, we c'n start talkin' 'bout other things uv a more plesunt natchure.

* * *

Well, here it is. I was on one uv my inspekshun tours one day last week 'n as ushul, I had Miss Schulte get out th' books f'r me t' see how things were goin'. Dear me, folks, I was quite upset when I saw th' drop in th' figgers on th' subskripshuns that go out t' th' individjuals. I asked May what was th' trubbul — wasn't SOCIAL JUSTICE up t' snuff these days 're what, 'n she said she was shure she didn't know what was th' matter, but somehow 'r other we didn't get many renewals on th' last expirashuns — those that ended in Oktober.

Now, if y' know uv enny uv y'r frien's who got a letter remindin' him uv th' fakt that his subskripshun was expirin' 'n he failed t' renew f'r some reason, will y' get after him?

We'll shure 'preshiate it out this way. We don't like to lose enny uv our readers, y' know, 'n I'm shure if they're reminded they'll take care uv it pronto.

That's th' end uv th' komplaints —y' c'n breathe easy now.

While I was tendin' t' biznuss I got around t' seein' th' girls 'n kidded with 'em a bit, too. Katie Clinton is on one uv her diets again, but nobuddy takes it very seryous. I guess they've seen these diets uv hers come 'n go f'r years now, 'n th' ol' candy machine gets th' best uv her ev'ry time. She's been known t' konsume at least five bars uv candy a day—'sides her reg'lar three squares. I guess she's cut that out now though f'r 'bout a week. Pretty good f'r her, eh?

It was Katie who tol' me t' be kareful 'n not menshun th' word "pumpkin" 'round Mr. Schwartz. When she tol' me she 'n all th' other girls roard with lafter, but I didn't get th' drift 'n they all giggled 'n tittered away so hard I couldn't find ennything out 'bout it.

It seems, I guess, that they've teased him 'bout somethin' pertainin' t' pumpkins 'round Halloween time, 'n he didn't like it enny too well—sorta hated t' be th' goat f'r their fun, I guess. Men 're funny that way, th' girls say.

* * *

Almost f'rgot—this is Armistice Day. It seems kinda silly, doesn't it, t' even menshun it, th' way this world is all in an uproar 'n ev'ry nashun goin' 'round with a chip on th' ol' sholder, jus' waitin' 'n hopin' somebuddy'll knock it off. No wunder I almos' f'rgot all 'bout it, eh? It looks like th' las' 20 years were justa breathin' spell t' get ready f'r a bigger'n better bout. Well, it seems t' be th' nature uv th' beast, so t' speak, t' just hafta fight.

It's too much f'r me — all this war talk. I've given up lookin' at th' funnies even, 'cause all they konsist uv enny more is airplanes pursuin' th' enemy 'n tanks rollin' all over th' page 'n shootin' 'n killin'.

Then, too, it seems t' me th' whole nashun, is in th' numbers racket. Ev'rybuddy hasta keep an eye skinned f'r his number t' appear in print, 'n then they're in th' army 'n hafta begin trainin' t' save somethin' from somebuddy. Oh, dear, it's too much f'r poor littul me.

But I c'n tell by th' clock that my number's up 'n I gotta go, too. So, goodbye once again, folks. I'm signing off f'r annuther week.

Take care uv y'rselves, now.

—Pete

SUBSCRIPTION COUPON

Date_____

Name_____

Address_____ City_____

State_____ Subscription rate $3 a year. Renewal ☐ New ☐

SOCIAL JUSTICE PUBLISHING CO., Royal Oak, Michigan

Comment

Who Lost the Presidential Election?

NAMES mean little.

Principles mean much.

Both contestants in the presidential election which is now history fought bitterly for victory.

Fifty-million Americans were forced to become partisans—some supporting Franklin D. Roosevelt and others supporting Wendell Willkie.

According to the advertised principles of these candidates, both promised to keep us out of war.

They remind the writer of the boy who promised not to get his feet wet although he persisted in playing in a puddle of muddy water.

Both candidates pledged themselves to national defense which, if not by words, at least by actions — meant defense of the British Empire.

Several weeks ago SOCIAL JUSTICE said that the American people had no candidate.

If the gentleman elected to the presidency still retains the principles and policies which he advertised for the past several months, SOCIAL JUSTICE still maintains that the American people have as a President today, a man who is more concerned with sustaining the economies, the finances and the stolen territories of the British Empire than he is in maintaining the liberties, the rights and the prerogatives and the prosperity of the American citizens.

Neither candidate lamented in the late campaign our recognition of Soviet Russia.

Both candidates were content to damn Adolf Hitler for his invasion of Poland and to remain silent about Josef Stalin and his seizure of part of Poland.

The truth of it is that both candidates were not so much concerned with eliminating communistic ideologies as they were concerned with opposing Hitlerian economics.

And both candidates were determined to pursue the undeclared war in which the United States finds itself at the moment.

* * *

Father Coughlin was definitely wise in refusing to commit himself publicly in support of either candidate.

The American people, five years hence, will recognize that they lost the election and that the forces of dissolution won the election, unless the victor is willing to liquidate his international ideas and adopt the principle of America for Americans.

That principle can and should be adopted immediately.

We can become a self-sustaining nation, together with the co-operation of Canada and the South American Republics.

Our chemists can produce the equivalent of silk, rubber and tin.

Our diplomats can build up amicable relations between the Americas.

Our bankers and financialists can expend their efforts on these two continents.

We must make the best of our being isolated. And we should prefer to remain isolated rather than expose ourselves to the germs of political sleeping sickness, cancer and what not which have overwhelmed Europe and Asia.

Let us not forget that America potentially is a land of plenty.

We can produce more foodstuffs than we can consume.

We can build more houses than we can use.

We can fabricate more clothing than we can wear.

We can construct more schools than we can fill.

All the raw materials are at hand.

All the inventive brains that we can employ are in our midst.

All the natural wealth that 300-million people can consume is available.

The problem of production long since has been solved.

There remains to discover an equitable solution for the problem of distribution.

That problem has been avoided conspicuously.

It is being voided in the attempt on our part, and on the part of Great Britain, to impose their methods now obsolete upon a war weary world.

Basically this problem, from an economic viewpoint, is related to money.

If, under the old system, we can not pay an annual wage to labor, let us abandon that horse and buggy system.

If, under the old system, we can not pay production-at-a-profit to the farmer, let us abandon that horse and buggy system.

If, under the old system, we can not pay the unbearable taxes, let us abandon that horse and buggy system.

Life can not be achieved by dying.

Life can be achieved by living — by distributing the abundance which a kind Providence has bestowed upon us.

Life can be achieved by producing.

For years SOCIAL JUSTICE, under the leadership of Father Coughlin, has endeavored to teach the American people the inefficiency and even the wickedness of the present financial system which weighs so heavily upon the world.

It has been our effort to insist that money is only the servant of man, not his master.

And it will be our effort to insist that men are more important than dollars based upon buried gold.

Index to Comment

Who Lost the Presidential Election?; Ten Years Hence ..... Page 3

Charles Chaplin; He Spared Stalin; Figures, or Pay Checks ..... Page 4

The Real Issue; What Price Defense; Censored in New York; Farm Cost Lesson ..... Page 5

Editorials: Pre-election Prediction; The Church — and the Future ..... Page 6

Refugees or Cowards; Immigrant Talents; Not 'That Kind' of Hostess ..... Page 7

A Secret Plane to Ottawa; Irvin S. Cobb; 'The Detroit News' Commentator ..... Page 8

New War Deal in the Pacific; Why Are We Not Told?; Presto, 'Democracy!' ..... Page 9

Our New Trade With Soviet Russia; Well, Well! ..... Page 10

The Warship Bungle; The World Tomorrow ..... Page 11

Belated Justice; Soviet Friendship ..... Page 12

Loans Bear Interest; Man vs. State; Slandering the Dead ..... Page 13

Censorship and Opinion; Destruction as an Industry; Who Started It?; Anglophiles and England; Inflation ..... Page 14

If the Constitution Goes, What Is Left?; Sabath and the Fifth Column ..... Page 15

A Letter to 'Social Justice' ..... Page 19

After the War — Chaos ..... Page 20

Ten Years Hence

WHEN the smoke of battle will have cleared;

When the madness of hate will have subsided;

When the vinegar of the grapes of wrath will have been consumed—men will take thought of the events which transpired during this decade.

Perhaps, the thought will be morbid thought.

The graves of millions of civilians;

The wrecked homes of millions of citizens;

The ruins of thousands of public institutions;

The memory of hundreds of lost liberties —these will be memories to haunt us.

The heroes of today will be heroes no longer.

The proud words of war will be regarded as insane words of hate.

How will our children appraise the wardheel speech of Joseph Kennedy and what will they say to his nine children?

How will future citizens damn Franklin D. Roosevelt and his intemperate plans which entangled this once free country in the bloody affairs of Europe and Asia?

Ten years hence, ideas will change—and so will policies.

Then, and only then, will historians begin to appraise the madness of our age. Those whom we regarded as heroes will be appraised as failures.

Their evil deeds will live after them; their good deeds will, in all likelihood, be forgotten.

And ten years hence, the boys and girls of today will be asking where were the leaders of yesterday? The educational leaders? The religious leaders? The industrial leaders?

Was their silence prudent?

Was their silence cowardly?

And some young man, raising his voice

(Continued on Page 4)

Comment

(Continued from Page 3)

above the others, will demand that the educational, religious and industrial leadership must never again submit subserviently to the political and financial monsters responsible for the worst misery this world ever experienced.

He will teach his fellow citizens that the material possessions owned by the educators, managed by the industrialists or supervised by the religionists were the cause of their prudent silence. Henceforth, he will say, there must never be another excuse for such silence. All of these leaders — silent leaders — must surrender their ownership and control and supervision over material possessions.

Alexander the Great was a hero to his contemporaries, but only a greedy grabber to historians.

Julius Caesar was a hero to his contemporaries, but only an ambitious marauder to the people whose lands and territories his legions confiscated.

Napoleon was a hero to the Frenchmen of his day, but only a bloody captain of destruction to the children of another day.

Even the mighty Woolsey, who said something about serving his God as well as serving his country, is despised. Events move more rapidly in our era—and conclusions are arrived at with more lightning-like promptitude.

Ten years hence, what will the world think of the leaders whom this generation applauds?

Their places in history are secure. So is Alexander's. So is Caesar's. So is Napoleon's. So is Woolsey's.

And so is Judas Iscariot's and Benedict Arnold's.

Charlie Chaplin

IT COMES as a great shock to the people, especially the common people, of the world that Charlie Chaplin has turned out to be a narrow, bigoted, pro-Communist warmonger.

In his latest picture, *"The Great Dictator,"* the once universally loved little man with the baggy pants has "gone Hollywood" — or, rather, "Moscow."

Supposed to be a satiric take-off on Hitler, the Chaplin movie out-propagandizes the most scurrilous war propaganda.

Hardly a foot of film does not contain some situation or incident intended to stir up hatred against Germans and condition Americans for a foreign war.

In the final reel Mr. Chaplin, in the role of a Jewish barber, makes a frank, 6-minute speech to the audience, calling on his listeners *to rise up and wipe out national boundaries.*

This phrase is one of the pet *cliches* of the Moscow Bolsheviks and has been preached by them for the past twenty-three years.

It sounds strange coming from the mouth of a world-famous millionaire movie actor, who before *"The Great Dictator"* had confined his acting entirely to pantomine.

* * *

Did the movie world have to wait more than ten years to hear Chaplin speak on the screen only to have him mouth Red war propaganda?

It was only natural that as a result of the opinions expressed in the movie it should receive its greatest reception from the cinema critic of the *Daily Worker,* New York Communist daily.

Other newspaper critics could heardly stomach the continuous beating of war drums for Great Britain and the exaggerated sympathy expressed for the Jews.

It was taken for granted in most circles that the "Jewishness" of the picture was understandably due to the widely-accepted fact that Chaplin himself was a Jew and as such deeply resentful of Hitler.

But a few days after *"The Great Dictator"* premiere, Mr. Chaplin in an interview in the *New York World-Telegram* denied that he is a Jew, although admitting *"I did this picture for the Jews of the world."*

Evidently Chaplin hasn't read page 161 *of "Who's Who in American Jewry"* (Volume 3; 1938-39).

Professing to be a *"Biographical Dictionary of Living Jews of the U. S. and Canada,"* the book contains the following paragraph:

"Chaplin, Charles Spencer, motion picture actor, produter. Born London, England, April 16, 1889, son of family named Thonstein which emigrated from Eastern Europe and settled in London, England, 1850."

Who is right? The Jewish *"Who's Who"* or Charlie Chaplin?

* * *

Could it be that Mr. Chaplin is trying to deceive the millions of Americans who have worshipped him without stint for a quarter of a century and who would rather go without shoes than miss one of his pictures?

Why should a man whom Jewish leaders call a Jew deny that he is a Jew?

And why should the same man devote all his genius — and two million dollars — on a film in favor of the Jews and in disfavor of non-Jews?

There are tens of millions of Christians suffering untold tortures in Europe today just as are hundreds of thousands of Jews.

Twenty million Christians died under the bloody Bolsheviks of Russia, just as some thousand or so Jews have died in Nazi concentration camps.

Do not the Christians deserve any sympathy?

* * *

Mr. Chaplin stated in his newspaper interview: "I'm no Jew, mind you. I'm no Jew."

"But," he added, "when I think of those poor people (Jews) wandering around the world on a boat, barred from every country, it makes me see red!"

It makes other people see "red" too, Mr. Chaplin.

But it seems that your sympathy for the Jews has run away with you, if the only way you can express it is by appeals to war and shameless repetition of Communist catchwords that have sent millions of Christians to their death.

*

Why He Spared Stalin

CHARLIE CHAPLIN'S rebuttal to his critics, in an interview for *Variety* amusement weekly, is enlightening.

The former idol of millions in the days of the silent movie is reported to have spent five years preparing *"The Great Dictator."* It was, says *Variety,* a one-man job and the producer resents most of all the suspicion that his product is "propaganda."

Charlie's explanation as to why Stalin was spared in his ridicule of dictators may serve as the "key" both to Chaplin and his picture:

"Had I included Stalin I would have surely been getting into politics *because there was no reason to include him from the standpoint I was taking,"* Chaplin told Herb Golden of *Variety.*

"He (Stalin) may be a dictator, but he's not persecuting helpless people because they are Jewish, or Chinese, or Mohammedan, or because he doesn't like the shape of their eyebrows. Had Stalin been doing such things he would have been included. I'm completely for the democratic way of life as it is lived in America and England. I want that clear."

Figures or Pay Checks

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE Jesse Jones announced recently that the national *per capita* income for the United States in 1939 was $536.

On the surface, comparing the figure with the 1933 income of $376, the sum would appear to represent a marked improvement in the economic health of the nation.

Per capita income means the amount each man, woman and child in the country would receive if the total national income were distributed equally among them.

Thus, by arithmetic, you can—if you want to mislead yourself—multiply $536 by four and arrive at the conclusion that the average family of four persons had an income of $2,144.

That, however, is somewhat faulty arithmetic, inasmuch as it paints a highly deceptive picture of the average income of America's working class. It is the kind of arithmetic employed by the New Deal to cover its miserable failure to achieve prosperity.

A breakdown of income statistics, showing population percentages in each income group *does* throw considerable light on the subject. Because 1939 figures for such a breakdown are not available, we must use those for 1936-37. It is safe to assume that no great disparity exists between the figures of the two periods, for '36 and '37 were comparatively "good years."

According to the aforementioned 1936-37 figures on income distribution, compiled from income tax reports to the Department of Interior, *81.82 per cent of the nation's workers received less than $2,000.* Approximately 68.68 per cent received less than $1,500; *nearly half of the working population—46.54 per cent—were in the class of workers earning no more than $1,000!*

The largest single income group, representing 14.93 per cent of America's wage and salary earners, received a paltry $500 to $750. Nearly one-third of the nation's workers, or 31.64 per cent, was in that group or in the two lower classes. The latter included more than 6,700,000 persons—exclusive of dependents—living on incomes of $500 or less.

Only 6.04 per cent of all persons employed drew more than $3,000.

That is the factual picture of income distribution.

Far from revealing a four-person family income of $2,144, it shows that more than 16-million workers were obliged to support themselves and their families on incomes of $1,000 or less.

Comment

The Real Issue

MORE THAN four years ago (September 12, 1936) SOCIAL JUSTICE carried a broadcast delivered by Father Coughlin.

It was entitled *"The Real Issue."*

It was the real issue then. It is the real issue now.

The major issue in the campaign just concluded appeared to be peace vs. war; or Americanism vs. internationalism.

But behind peace and war, on the one hand, and Americanism and internationalism, on the other, there is still the issue of the money-changers.

It will be the issue as long as government is controlled by them.

It will be the issue as long as they are permitted to control government.

It will be the issue as long as they can throttle production and stifle distribution by their control of the money of a free country.

And this control does not mean that they have all the money in their vaults.

It does mean that by law—be it constitutional or unconstitutional—they are permitted to issue money; and by law the $18-billion of gold, for the most part, which our Government buried at Fort Knox, belongs to them as a guarantee of payments for the debts which the citizens of the United States owe to them.

* * *

Thus the bankers, who create money out of nothing except by a stroke of the pen, control the destinies of America and of the world.

Europe, of course, has slipped from their control.

But back of this World War is the effort on the part of the international bankers to recapture Europe and impose again their money control upon the nations of Europe.

Do not interpret this statement as one applauding the Europeans.

Negatively, Hitler and the totalitarians are right in so far as they are opposed to the international money-changers.

Positively, Hitler and the United States are not right in so far as they are not trying to set up the full program of Christian social justice.

* * *

But back to four years ago.

On September 12, 1936, Father Coughlin spoke of *"The Real Issue"*—which is the same issue today, and will be the same issue tomorrow, until the money-changers are put in their places.

Here are some excerpts from what the Radio Priest said four years ago—excerpts which should be brought to the attention of the victor at the polls last Tuesday:

'In our day there is more need than ever for men to seek first the kingdom of God and His Justice so that all things else—food, raiment and shelter, together with life's conveniences—shall be added unto us.

"If man-made justice stands as an obstacle in the pathway of realizing this goal, man's justice must give way to God's Justice!

"If an economic system, described as cruel and harsh by the leaders of Christianity, prevents distribution of God's gifts to our fellowmen, that economic system must be cashiered as was the imperialism of the Caesars, the feudalism of the Charlemagnes, and the 'divine rights of kings' of a George III.

"Therefore, the present social order of modern capitalism whereby 'wealth is concentrated in the hands of a few' and 'want exists in the midst of plenty' must be amended, just as forcefully as must be opposed the proposed social order of Communism which illogically proposes to cancel the concept of God, to destroy the possession of private property and to barter the rights of individuals for a meager mess of pottage.

"Christianity realizes that the hourly wage system of modern capitalistic industrialism must pass out of existence and, in its stead, there must be substituted a living, annual wage.

* * *

"As far as we Americans are concerned, our forefathers were opposed to the private issuance and regulation of money. They believed that the people should issue and regulate money.

"They wrote into the *Constitution* that the representatives of the people, namely Congress, has the right *to coin, issue and regulate all the money in this nation.*

"This," Father Coughlin continued, "is contrary to the present practice of modern capitalism, which permits a handful of bankers, who own the Federal Reserve Banking System, to coin and regulate the value of more than 95 per cent of all the money used by Americans.

"As long as the borrowing of fictitious money from the privately-owned Federal Reserve Banks continues; as long as taxation exacted from the American public through the process of hard labor is permitted to exist for the support of these private coiners of money; as long as the laboring man and the farmer must contribute one out of every three days of labor, as he is doing at the present moment, for the support of the private creators of money; there can be no New Deal and there can be no real prosperity, despite the unctuous words which herald its arrival . . .

"If this be prosperity which we are enjoying today, with its less than living wage and its support of the kept Federal Reserve bankers, I want none of it, as I envision the future and the price which the children of this generation will be forced to pay."

What Price Defense?

"THE BEDROOM is of weathered sycamore and the lounge is upholstered in beige. When completed early next year (the train) will be the most modern and most luxurious in the world. The cars will be air-conditioned, with electric fireplaces in every room."

The above description does not apply to a new American streamline train built for our more fortunate billionaires. It describes a train being built in England, in time of war and travail, when every factory is strained to the utmost for the cause of defense.

The British government, characteristically has chosen the most trying year in its whole history in which to build a super-luxury railway train for its King and Queen and the young princesses.

Thus, while the people of London cringe in their dank, disease-ridden and admittedly inadequate bomb shelters, their regal rulers may relax comfortably in a super-deluxe royal train, and stare at "white and cream" ceilings.

Censored in New York

ALTHOUGH the Mutual Broadcasting System recently carried Colonel Lindbergh's speech on the other stations of its network, the Colonel was not heard over the radio chain's outlet for the New York area, WOR.

The excuse given was that WOR had previously contracted for a speech by Mayor LaGuardia.

New Yorkers, however, have been subject so long to undemocratic radio and press control that they could only smile at such an *alibi.*

Mutual, like the other major broadcasting networks, is Jewish controlled.

For the past several years New York has only been allowed to hear what these radio dictators have allowed.

Since Colonel Lindbergh is pro-American instead of pro-British, his voice was banned.

The nation-wide censorship of Father Coughlin also started in New York.

The Hearst newspaper chain has dropped the daily column of Boake Carter, one of the few remaining pro-American columnists from the *New York Daily Mirror*, although it still continues to carry Mr. Carter's writings in many of its other papers.

This was done in deference to the wishes of such organizations as the *Anti-Nazi League.*

Professor Harry Elmer Barnes, an ardent isolationist, was dropped from the *New York World-Telegram* for the same reason.

The "directors" of public opinion in New York have now made it an established rule that only those who are in favor of war against Germany, or aid to Britain, are permitted the right of freedom of speech.

Dissenters receive the same dose of enforced silence as is given to anti-Nazis in Germany.

Farm Cost Lesson

GENERAL HUGH S. JOHNSON, in a recent *Saturday Evening Post* article, did a thoroughly first-rate job of appraising Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture in the Roosevelt Cabinet and the President's running mate in the third term campaign.

It was a piece that Henry would not treasure, for it stressed the inconsistencies, contradictions, nonsense and terrible failures of the Secretary's agricultural nostrums.

As we say, the General did a fine job; but he stubbed his toe in referring disparagingly to Cost-of-Production as the "most radical and impractical farm scheme" proposed in the last few years.

One of his chief complaints was that "you couldn't, by American law, make foreigners pay the fixed price for the exported surplus, and nobody here would buy it to sell abroad at a loss . . . The plan simply ignored the export problem . . ."

Apparently the General hasn't spent much time studying Cost-of-Production. The plan provides for a fixed price only for that portion of products used *domestically.*

The exportable surplus would go on the export market at world prices, not the fixed American price.

NATIONAL WEEKLY

Social Justice

Published by The Social Justice Publishing Co.

Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

Pre-Election Prediction

NOW THAT the election is over;

Now that all Americans are supposed to put aside party differences and be unanimously for the victor, let us read the pre-election prediction made by Mr. Emil Hurja, as printed in the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch.*

Did Mr. Hurja duplicate his 1936 achievement—or did he?

Some "insiders" tell us that, upon this Hurja prediction, several big bettors wagered at 7 to 5 for Mr. Willkie's victory.

The prediction, dated October 30th, read as follows:

"An indicated Willkie victory with 353 electoral votes was the conclusion today of Emil Hurja on the basis of figures gathered up to October 26 by his weekly news magazine, the *Pathfinder*, and through a sampling process similar to that of the Gallup poll.

"Hurja made a reputation as a successful political prophet while an aid to the chairman of the Democratic National Committee in 1932 and 1936. He is convinced, he told the writer today, that the tide is now running strongly for the Republican candidate.

"Hurja's latest figures, released through his magazine, show Willkie ahead in 29 states and Roosevelt in 19. Roosevelt's total of electoral votes is placed at only 178, against the 523 he received in 1936. Necessary to win are 266."

* * *

As stated on page 2, in *The Dinner Chats*, we are going to press before election day.

In fact, it is last Friday afternoon, November 1—according to your computation—that these words are being pounded out.

In the long run we are more concerned with principles than we are with men.

If the right principles are not in government, no man can make government a success.

One can not dig a Panama Canal with a tooth-pick and one can not govern the United States with a weak set of principles.

As far as we are concerned, there is only one set of principles—and these are Christian.

They are positively Christian—not only negatively anti-Communist, anti-Nazi or anti-New Deal.

They are Christian 100 per cent without any compromise.

Indeed, Christianity is not only a religion for the individual man. It is a religion for the human race.

It is not only a religion for the individual family. It is a religion for an entire nation.

Both Roosevelt and Willkie combined, together with all the industrialists, bankers, educators and what-nots of America can not make a success out of this country, any more than they can make a silk purse out of a sow's ear, unless their "kit of tools" contains the proven principles of Christianity.

Paganistic principles are inefficient tools.

Mohammedan principles are inefficient tools.

Pragmatic principles are inefficient tools.

Judaic principles are inefficient tools.

If there are some 30-million Christians in this nation, it is high-time that they recognize the need of applied Christian principles to government if they entertain hope that this nation will continue.

The Church—and the Future

CHURCHMEN throughout the world are contemplating the future of religion.

Some of them are content to recollect that Christ said *"I will be with you all days until the consummation of the world."*

On the strength of the quotation they are inclined to believe that, despite whatever happens, the Church will continue to operate and flourish.

Unfortunately, Christ's promise was not geographical in the sense that He said that the Church would continue to flourish in any given territory.

As a matter of fact, it once flourished in North Africa—and then decayed.

As a matter of fact, it flourished in other territories—and decayed.

Others remind us that the fate of the Church will parallel the fate of Christ.

And what was Christ's fate?

And what will be Christ's Bride fate?

In His public life Christ flourished—according to the concept of the world—for a short time.

He fed the poor.

He cleansed the lepers.

He calmed the waters.

He raised the dead.

He won to Himself the tremendous following of oppressed people who attempted to crown Him king.

The Church, His Bride, experienced a similar period in her history.

Emerging from the catacombs, as Christ emerged from Nazareth, the Church was instrumental in feeding the poor, healing the sick and raising the dead to life—to spiritual life.

And the nations of the middle century world would crown her Queen.

* * *

In Christ's life, He met opposition—an opposition from without and from within His own ranks.

The Scribes, Pharisees, Sadducees and high priests of another day also conspired against the Bride of Christ—His Church.

They accused her of being anti-patriot.

They calumniated her on the charge of consorting with sinners.

Perhaps, today, she is in Her Gethsemane.

Perhaps, today, there is some Judas Iscariot—ready to sell Her for 30 pieces of silver—or thirty pieces of gold.

Soon, She will have Her hour in Pilate's hall—a Pilate who for fear of the great Caesar and the aroused populace, will wash his hands clean of Her.

Soon, She will have Her hour in the hall of the high priests of this world's materialistic religion—high priests who will shout for Barabbas; high priests who will demand death for Christ's Bride.

Soon, She will have Her hour, forced to walk through the streets of this modern Jerusalem—carrying a cross and beaten by the soldiery controlled by the Annases and Caiphases.

Soon, She will have Her hour on Calvary, done to death between two thieves.

The last book in the Bible is named by Protestants *"The Book of Revelations."* By Catholics, it is called *"The Apocalypse."*

It is the Holy Ghost's prophetical, though veiled, disclosures of what will happen.

We are told that even the elect, if possible, will be deceived. We are told that anti-Christ will ride rough-shod over civilization.

We are told, inferentially, that the Bride of Christ will be ravaged.

Let not Christians be too smug in their complacency.

Let not churchmen be too secure in their offices.

But—and this is of most importance—if the Bride of Christ is destined to walk the parallel path trod by Christ, She will come to Calvary. But She will also come to the resurrection from the dead, glorious and immortal.

"My kingdom is not of this world," said Christ.

And the kingdom of His Bride is not of this world.

Of old it was said that the blood of martyrs was the seed of Christians.

Perhaps, a little suffering on the part of church members—even though they are 120 in number—would be an advantageous thing for the Church in general.

Comment

Refugees or Cowards

"NEW YORK today has become the melting pot of the most notorious 'detrimentals' Europe has to offer," writes Cholly Knickerbocker, widely known society columnist of the *New York Journal-American.*

"It's positively frightening—this deluge of social and political scum from Europe," this observer writes.

"Men and women of doubtful Mayfair origin with, er, decidedly 'colorful' pasts, and traitorous politicians who dishonestly enriched themselves by 'selling out' their stricken countries, have poured onto these shores in amazing numbers—fleeing like 'rats' they are before the enemy.

"Which probably is the reason all 'refugees' are closely scrutinized by New York's more careful hostesses, and their 'past performances' reviewed before invitations are sent to lunch or dine in our more respectable households.

* * *

"Few of the 'refugees' I encounter in my rounds of society," the columnist continues, "are deserving of pity—they really should be objects of scorn!"

The columnist's indictment, widely quoted by the press, including the *Tablet* of Brooklyn, continues:

"They're here to protect themselves and their GOLD. The latter they cleverly contrived to get out of their native lands when disaster threatened. As for their carcasses —these social 'refugees' came to our safe shores when they should have remained where they belong, ready to help those of their stricken countrymen less fortunately placed, so far as this world's goods are concerned.

"When the history of this war is written the chapters devoted to social 'refugees' will be black, unpleasant ones. Those chapters will deal with the cowards of the war —the cowards who, apparently, care nothing about what happens to their homelands and their compatriots, now that they are safely settled here in New York, living off the fat of the land—thanks to the well-filled money-bags they managed to smuggle out.

"Believe it or not, these cowards of war absent themselves from the many fetes given by humanitarian members of New York society to alleviate suffering among the poor, wounded and hungry of the very countries the cowards 'ratted' on.

"When approached for donations to help their own they brazenly lie and say they have no money to give.

"Then they order an expensive dinner, vintage wine—and offer up thanks to Allah that they are safe!

* * *

"As I've reported they represent the social and political scum of Europe and 'tis little wonder New York society, with the exception of the outer fringes of 'Cafe Society,' has kept this scum on the outside, looking in at our social life.

"Unscrupulous Old World politicians who were traitors to their countries, selling secrets to the enemy, looting government tills of vast sums of money, etc., are the worst 'bounders' to be encountered in the fashionable hotels and restaurants at the moment.

"They're loud, coarse and blatantly vulgar about their 'cleverness' in 'getting out in time.'

"The other night I noted at one table in the supper room of a smart Fifth Ave. hotel a man credited with having crippled France's air force by secretly selling that country's best planes to Spain; the ex-holder of a high office in the royal Belgian government, now suspected of having carried on, from the beginning of the war, undercover dealings with Hitler's 'Brain Trust' in Berlin; a man said to be promoting Japan's interests in the new Berlin-Rome-Tokio axis—and their trio of lavishly gowned and fantastically bejeweled wives.

"There they were, seated among Vanderbilts, Astors, Huttons, Dukes and others of our 'Smart Set'—never uttering a word in English.

"They had 'tipped' the headwaiter handsomely and had the most conspicuous table in the supper room. Those around them imagined they were just another tableful of 'refugees.'

"Little did they suspect that group constituted a definite menace to life as lived by the average New Yorker.

"Need I add the cowards were eating boneless squab and guzzling champagne while the countries they betrayed are prostrate beneath Hitler's heel—and their countrymen are dropping in their tracks from a lack of nourishment.

"Don't be fooled into sympathy for the social 'refugees'—that term 'refugee,' in the world I move in, simply cloaks a coward!"

Immigrant Talents

ONE OF THE great historical consequences of the war is already evident in the shifting of intellectual and literary centers of Western civilization from Europe to America.

Almost every incoming ship and air liner adds to the number of these immigrants.

A list of the writers of international celebrity who are already here would include such names as Maurice Maeterlinck, Heinrich and Thomas Mann, Sigrid Undset, Jules Romains, Arnold Zweig, Lion Feuchtwanger, Franz Werfel, Andre Maurois and Dr. Einstein.

"What will be the effect of this wholesale immigration of talent on American letters and thus, indirectly, on American life and culture?" asks the *Washington Post.*

"Will our literature, which less than a generation ago burst the bonds of what Mr. Santayana has called 'the genteel tradition,' become Europeanized in content as well as in form? Or will these European writers become in due time as egregiously American as, for example, our Mr. Farrell or Mr. Saroyan?

"Neither of these possible developments," thinks the *Post* editorial writer, "may be expected to come to pass. No talent can afford to divorce itself spiritually from the tradition which has nourished it," he observes.

"Those European exiles and those Americans who may attempt it are more likely to face sterility than transformation.

"The presence of all these writers in America may have an effect comparable to that of the flight of so many Greek scholars and artists to Italy of the *quattrocento,*" the editorial concludes.

"The world of the Renaissance had little resemblance to the world of Byzantium, and even less to that world of classical antiquity which it sought to resurrect. Nevertheless, it was, in itself, something magnificent."

* * *

Perhaps no one of these refugee writers listed above is more of a gain to America than Madame Sigrid Undset, the Norwegian convert to Catholicity and winner of the Noble prize for literature, who is in great demand as a lecturer.

On October 18, at the Mayflower hotel in Washington, D.C., Madame Undset was heard by a distinguished audience of more than 1,000 persons, including Crown Princess Bartha of Norway, diplomats, and members of the Catholic clergy. The Rev. Francis C. Talbot, S.J, editor of *America,* presided. The lecture was sponsored by *America* magazine in association with the Catholic Library of Washington and affiliated Catholic societies.

Her address concluded:

"If democracy wins, there will be maybe a hundred years of darkness. If Germany wins, no one can know how long darkness will cover the earth. And even if England wins, we must watch for a recurrence of totalitarian ideas. No matter what the end is, there will be no more gladness on earth in our time. But *ultimately* civilization will be resurrected, *ultimately* the people of the world who represent the Christian way of life will triumph over the diabolical forces of darkness."

Not 'That Kind' of Hostesses

ARMY BRASS HATS are sorry they gave the wrong impression to our boys and girls in announcing that hostesses would be employed to take up the slack in the life of conscriptees.

Due to a misunderstanding of what was implied by the term "hostess," bales of applications for positions have poured into offices of the high command in Washington.

Moreover, indignant mothers of potential conscriptees have flooded the War Office with stern objections. The mothers let it be known that frivolous young ladies should not be subsidized by the Government to show their sons the gayer side of life.

It seems now that there are two or more species of hostess. One, according to popular standards, is young, pretty and more than moderately sociable. Though it may be debatable, education and intelligence are considered in some quarters as serious handicaps to this species. Personal charm and attractiveness, together with a convivial nature, are the prime requisites.

This species may be found in just the places you might expect.

The army gentlemen have hastened to pacify aroused mothers by explaining that the foregoing species is not the one sought to lighten the burden of conscriptees.

In press statements they have also discouraged this species from applying for positions.

Symmetry of figure, beauty of face and fewness of birthdays will not enter into the calculations for hostess qualifications, the Army reveals.

Instead, more prosaic qualities will be emphasized — administrative ability, intelligence, tact, physical stamina and good character.

This news should be very comforting, not only to the entertainment business, but to anxious mothers who took the Army too literally and expressed fear that their sons would find an unwholesome surplus of cheer during their year of service.

In the future, it is hoped, our officials will be still more specific in announcing bright new plans for bolstering the morale of their boys.

Otherwise we might even be guilty of obtaining our recruits under false pretenses.

Comment

A Secret Plane to Ottawa

THE *New York Sun* for October 29th printed the following news story:

"Under mysterious circumstances, a plane chartered by the Sperry Gyroscope Company of Brooklyn, which makes many of the parts for the secret bomb sight of the United States Navy, was flown from LaGuardia Field to Ottawa, Canada, on October 22, it was learned today.

"Whether the cargo consisted of bomb sight parts, whose manufacture is a closely guarded secret, could not be learned definitely. It was only with reluctance that American Airlines admitted it had chartered a plane to the Sperry firm. The air line was told that the plane was to be used for an experimental radio flight, a representative said.

"Such experimental flights by the Sperry company are not unusual, and on trips of that kind company officials frequently have taken relatives and friends aloft for the ride. But last Tuesday's flight was far different.

Mystery in Trip

"In Congress members have inquired whether the United States was supplying the British with the bomb sight. Official silence has been the only answer.

"Here, it was learned, were the circumstances surrounding last Tuesday's trip between LaGuardia Field and Ottawa:

"Between midnight and dawn a 3,000-pound cargo boxed in sealed wooden crates was packed aboard an American Airlines Douglas DC-3 transport plane in Hangar 1, LaGuardia Field.

"Later in the morning five passengers and a crew comprised of the captain and first officer, but without a stewardess, entered the plane in the hangar. The motors were started, the doors of the hangar were thrown open. The plane started forward, taxied to the runway without a halt, and took aloft.

"Ordinarily cargos are loaded outside hangars, and passengers and crew enter planes from the field or the passenger loading deck.

Secrecy Marks Take-Off

"There were other unusual circumstances surrounding the flight.

"The identities of those who made the flight or had any association with it were withheld. Customs Inspectors Harold Adams and John O'Shea, regularly assigned to duty at LaGuardia Field, did not handle the trip, but an inspector came from the Customs House in Manhattan to pass on the cargo.

The contents of the cargo was not revealed. No flight plan was filed with the airways traffic control. Cargo contents were not listed on the United States customs forms.

"Late in the afternoon the plane returned to LaGuardia Field with the same crew and two passengers. The cargo had been left in Ottawa, and three passengers had remained in Canada.

"The bomb sight is manufactured by three firms, each of which makes distinct parts which, when fitted together, comprise the sight. This process protects the secret. If the plans of one firm were stolen or lost, or came into the possession of unauthorized persons in any manner, the secret still would not be divulged because of the lack of knowledge on the manufacturing processes of the others firms.

"However, of the three firms making parts for the sights, the Sperry company manufactures the largest percentage."

* * *

President Roosevelt plans to ship 12,000 planes to England—in the spirit of national defense.

More startling, this administration plans to make an outright delivery of our secret bomb sights.

As this war proceeds, the observer becomes more convinced that behind the scenes of the petty men like Hitler, Mussolini, Stalin and Roosevelt there hovers some black angel from hell.

The ultimate of destruction about to be suffered by the world as a result of this war is too fantastic to be the brain product of any human being.

Indeed, there are spirits of darkness as well as spirits of light, in this world of ours.

"You are either with Me or against Me," said Christ.

You are either a member of the Mystical Body of Christ, or a member of the mystical body of Satan.

And in so far as the members of the Mystical Body of Christ are animated by the Spirit of Truth, the Holy Ghost, the members of the mystical body of Satan are animated by the spirit of lies, the "unholy ghost."

* * *

We become excited over news of sending secret bombing sights to Canada; we become overwrought with politics, preparedness, industry, finance, totalitarianism, democracy, Hitler, Stalin and Roosevelt.

But of more concern than all these, it seems to us, is the "unseen hand" which guides the destinies of those who are members of the mystical body of Satan.

It is a hand which moves them like puppets.

It is a hand lifted against the immortal Christ.

As Catholics know, following a low mass, the priest recites, among other prayers, one addressed to St. Michael, the Archangel. This Archangel who is credited, under God, with driving Satan and his cohorts into hell, is called upon to repeat his victory in these, our days.

"Drive back into hell Satan and all the evil spirits who wander through the world seeking the ruin of souls."

The writer oftentimes has listened to the priests at the Shrine of the Little Flower recite these words vigorously, prayerfully and meaningfully.

Perhaps it would pay our country more dividends to manufacture spiritual bomb sights that would direct our missles against the real geniuses of destruction who are regulating their puppets.

We mean the bomb sights of prayer and the revival of devotion to the Holy Ghost, Who is the soul of the Mystical Body of Christ.

Irvin S. Cobb

THE HIGH POINT for humor in the campaign just closed goes to the nation's evenings with our colleague from Paducah, Mr. Irvin S. Cobb.

Cobb, as colorful as any character of his literary creation, spoke to fellow Democrats on behalf of the "only Democrat running in the campaign—Mr. Wendell Willkie."

The rotten eggs with which the Republican candidate was received in some Roosevelt strongholds was, Mr. Cobb observed, "symbolic of the New Deal—all bright and shiny on the outside, but foul and yellow on the inside!"

The platforms of the political parties nowadays, he said, are something like the one down at the depot:

"You get on by it, but you don't ride very far on the platform."

'Detroit News' Commentator

THE DETROIT NEWS is accepted as a rather conservative newspaper.

Its chief reason for existence is to make money for its owners.

Like most newspapers, it reports what news its editors want to print.

Like most newspapers, it expends an insignificant amount of space in promoting the spiritual concept of life.

Indeed, if an Archbishop lays a cornerstone, it reports the event. But, like most newspapers, it does not campaign in season and out of season for the vital truths and principles of Christianity.

One of the chief editorial contributors to *The Detroit News* is Mr. W. K. Kelsey, widely known as "The Commentator."

Recently he received a letter from a Christian student chiding him for his materialistic concept of life and for his failure to emphasize the spiritualities.

In reply to the student, a Mr. Gervais, W. K. Kelsey sent him the following letter:

"Dear Mr. Gervais:

"Wait till you've attended college two or three more years, and have taken a few courses in philosophy, before you start giving me advice about my soul. Maybe you will discover that there are about as many Gods as there are people in the world; and then you will have to define what God you are talking about.

"When I look about me and see how so-called Christians conduct themselves, I wonder how you or anyone else can talk about how the individual begins to 'live and flower' under the teaching he receives from some so-called spiritual guides.

"Why don't you, just for fun, study pragmatism? It might given you a new conception of divinity, even if you didn't agree with it.

"Sincerely yours,

(Sgd) W. K. Kelsey

"P. S. By the way, the *Commentator* isn't a Public Letter Box, and I have not invited discussion of this topic."

* * *

So Mr. Kelsey believes there are "as many Gods as there are people in the world."

So Mr. Kelsey has little use for Christianity, because so many so-called Christians conduct themselves in a manner open to criticism.

So Mr. Kelsey believes that pragmatism is a good philosophy of life. And by pragmatism we mean that philosophy which is concerned with getting things done no matter by what means they are done; that philosophy which believes in getting happiness — so-called happiness — no matter by what means the happiness is acquired.

Mr. Kelsey is not singular in his journalistic beliefs. He is a type of modern journalist.

And the gentleman definitely is not Christian, if he seriously entertains the beliefs expressed above.

Comment

New War Deal in the Pacific

LORD LOTHIAN'S sudden and unexpected return to London is reported now to have been for the purpose of discussing the full details of an Anglo-Australian-American "understanding," which has been in process of negotiation for many months.

At the same time, Ambassador Kennedy's return to the United States is reportedly for the same purpose.

If Messrs. Kennedy and Lothian are able to get immediate action, the announcement of the agreement with its terms, provisions and guarantees is planned as the "bombshell" promised for the eve of the election.

One of the reported provisions of this "treaty," or arrangement, is that Britain and America shall undertake the joint defense of Dakar Africa. Americans fear the present German and Italian domination of Dakar which could easily become the jumping-off place for an axis attack on South America.

It is well to remember, however, that if the axis partners wish to attack South America, they will first have to build planes which have a far greater flying range and carrying power than their present ones.

It seems, therefore, that any "attack" on South America is remote: for until now Italy and Germany have been content with building planes light, fast and with low flying range. Obviously, such planes cannot carry both gasoline and bombs in anything like an adequate quantity to make them useful in any transatlantic *blitzkrieg*.

* * *

On the other hand, it is reported that America is about to guarantee to protect British sovereignty in the Far East through our Pacific fleet. America would be permitted to use all British air and naval bases in the Far East for this defense.

The British, of course, realize that if the Dutch East Indies and Singapore were to fall, together with Indo-China, not only will the British empire in Asia be imperilled but also Australia, New Zealand and South Wales will be cut off from the empire and lay undefended for any attack by any hostile power.

It seems that America will also promise that our fleet and air force will combine with the British fleet and air force to maintain the *status quo* in the East.

Great Britain, it is said, will release to America the electrically-operated cannon turret for aircraft now being added by British manufacturers to American planes used in the battle of Britain.

And America would release to Britain 50 of the professedly "obsolete," "old-fashioned" and "inadequately equipped" Boeing flying fortresses. Britain hopes to use these planes for distance bombing in the Near and Far East.

Whereas America received the better of the bargain in the destroyer-air base deal, Great Britain and the Commonwealth would receive the better of the deal regarding the defense of the Pacific and the Far East.

In fact, the earlier destroyer-air bases deal was only the first phase of the complete understanding which is to be concluded in this Pacific agreement.

England and Canada agreed in the first "deal" to defend America and its interests in Central and South America; but America now plans to undertake to protect British possessions and interests in the Far East.

The destroyers in the first instance, and the airplanes in the second phase of the deal, are in reality outright gifts to Britain, a sort of down payment on the "treaties" to bind the bargain.

* * *

Americans generally were led to believe that Britain had sacrificed everything to lease air and naval bases, to donate other air and naval bases, and to co-operate with America thus to protect America's sphere of influence in this hemisphere.

American newspaper readers were then prepared to receive the further announcement that now, since America has succeeded in establishing (on paper) a defense for the Western Hemisphere, this country is prepared to aid Britain in defending the rest of the world which is comprised within the British Empire's vast sphere of influence.

Negotiations and discussions of the Anglo-Australian-America agreement began immediately after the consummation of the air bases-destroyer deal.

The Triple-A entente did their very best to draw Soviet Russia, an Asiatic power, into the deal, but the American Under-Secretary of State, Sumner Welles, was unable to convince Comrade Constantine Oumansky that Soviet Russia would receive a fair compensation for her part in the agreement of mutual assistance to preserve the *status quo* in the Far East.

America, under these reciprocal obligations, is as much at war as those nations of Europe and Asia who, until this time, have themselves fought a war of pacts, treaties and agreements in chancelleries.

Why Are We Not Told?

"THE PEOPLE in France were badly misinformed," Genevieve Tabouis, French newspaper woman in exile, told a Kansas City Woman's club recently. The account does not say whether she also informed her audience that she helped in the misinformation.

"The average Frenchman," said Mmes. Tabouis, "never would have been defeated if he had known the truth . . . A democracy must be informed. The people must know, as they are the ones who vote, who act and who fight."

To which the *Kansas City Star* observes:

"These are words to remember, when we discover the Secretary of War has imposed a rigid censorship in the War Department and refuses to give out any information concerning the actual condition of the United States Army and Air Corps—on the pretext that such information might come to 'hostile' eyes although the country is still at peace.

"These are words to remember, when we find that the President has failed to appoint a chairman for the vital commission on national defense and insists on serving as official spokesman of the commission—so that the country is kept in the dark as to what equipment is on hand and what is on order.

"What do we really know about the progress of our defense program? What do we really know about the President's intentions affecting domestic policy? What do we really know about the handling of our foreign relations? Are we as well informed as the people of a democracy are entitled to be, as they must be to vote and act intelligently?"

Presto—'Democracy'!

THE WAR between the Italians and the Greeks sheds further light on Britain's valiant struggle for "democracy, humanity and freedom."

Until the Italian invasion of the Greek peninsula, Greece was considered an autocracy, a Fascist state, a tool of the Axis — and worse.

Then, as the Duce's soldiers marched into Epirus, the British and American controlled press did an about-face.

Premier Metaxas, the former Fascist and pro-Nazi, became overnight a "defender of the democratic way of life."

Greece's muzzled press, its stringent Nazi laws against Reds and labor agitators, its concentration camps, its one party system all were forgotten.

King George of Britain in his personal message to the Greek king stated:

"We are with you in this struggle — your cause is our cause — we shall be fighting against a common foe.

"There are doubtless hard trials to be borne, but we shall both meet them in the firm faith that ultimate victory is assured by the ever-increasing strength of the free peoples."

So overnight the Greeks become a free people!

* * *

But did the Greeks change their Fascist form of government after being invaded?

Not at all.

The dictatorship of Premier John Metaxas became, if anything, more brutal and centralized.

And if anyone has doubts as to the type of government now enjoyed by the Greeks one has only to read such standard reference works as the *"World Almanac"* or the *"New International Year Book."*

The 1939 edition of the latter states on page 334:

"The government in force in 1939 was a dictatorship in the hands of Premier John Metaxas, acting as the servant of the Crown.

"This dictatorship came into existence on August 4, 1936, with the support of royal decrees dissolving Parliament, suspending constitutional guarantees, abolishing the political parties, and subjecting the press to supervision and censorship.

"At the end of July, 1939, Metaxas was declared dictator for life."

The 1940 *"World Almanac"* adds: "Metaxas has tried to fashion a Fascist state, with large expenditures for rearmament."

* * *

The same world press which is now hailing the free Greeks has been calling Greeks slaves of a totalitarian government for the last four years.

By these means we at last can arrive at a definition of the word "democracy."

A "democracy" is a country which fights for Britain; a "dictatorship" is a country which fights against Britain.

The actual form of government inside a country has nothing to do with the definition of democracy in current usage.

Greece is actually a dictatorship, but now that it is fighting on Britain's side it becomes a "democracy."

Soviet Russia is a dictatorship, but it will be called a fairer name if it joins London.

When Greece surrenders to Italy it will revert to a Totalitarian State and the Greeks will then be called "cowards" and "Fascists," exactly as happened in France.

Paraphrasing Gertrude Stein — a "democracy is a pro-British dictatorship is a democracy."

Our New Trade With Russia

REPORTS filtering through the war news indicate that as a result of the recent renewal of Russo-American trade agreement, Soviet Russia has shipped millions of dollars in gold to the United States.

Recently a ship arrived in a West Coast port carrying $8-million in gold from Russia to America

Soviet Russia will purchase wheat, oil, machinery and commodities. Of course, Russia will re-sell these materials at a profit to the warring nations — especially to the axis partners who are willing to pay premium prices for our commodities and petroleum

Soviet Russia, purchasing America's surplus commodities through Government subsidies, will sell these same commodities at inflated prices to the warring and starving nations, and thus realize a profit off the transaction

America, of course, will not sell directly to the warring or conquered nations; but she will sell to Russia, a warring nation, and thus aid the Communists to exploit starvation, famine and destruction for the eventual sovietization of Europe.

* * *

The American State Department evidently prefers to forget Molotov's acrimonious condemnation of the United States delivered to the Supreme Soviet on August 2, 1940, when the Russian parliament ratified the union of the Baltic States and of the territories ceded by Roumania

Viaschelav Molotov, Commissar of Foreign Affairs, then warned that the "imperialist war" would spread to the Western Hemisphere and would become a universal conflagration Although he aimed sharp blows at Britain and the United States, he reported that the Soviet Union's relations with Germany and Italy were of the best.

Said Molotov:

"I will not dwell on our relations with the United States of America if only *for the reason that there is nothing good that can be said about them*

"We have learned that there are certain people in the United States who are not pleased with the successes of our foreign policy in the Baltic countries. But we must confess that we are little concerned over this fact inasmuch as we cope with our tasks without the assistance of these displeased gentlemen

"However the fact that the authorities in the United States unlawfully placed an embargo on the gold which our State bank recently purchased from the banks of Lithuania Latvia and Esthonia meets with the most energetic protest on our part. In this case we can only remind both the Government of the United States and the Government of Britain, which adopted the same procedure, of their responsibility for these illegal acts."

Premier Molotov did not mention that when the Soviet government took over Latvia, Lithuania and Esthonia all the debts of these countries owed to Americans were repudiated — exactly as the old Bolsheviks did in Russia

Esthonia had an outstanding indebtedness in the hands of the American public amounting to $3,339,500. Lithuania had one outstanding loan of $501,600 held by the public, and a "match monopoly" loan of $4,199,094 held by financial institutions.

Molotov pointed out that both the United States and England had adopted the same policy of placing an embargo on the purchase of the gold which Soviet Russia ostensibly "purchased" from the State banks in the conquered nations.

* * *

Molotov knew that the diplomats of England were creating and conditioning America's war, commercial, and financial policies. No doubt, America's present willingness to do business with Soviet Russia was inspired by British efforts to consolidate Russia, thus to create another defense of Britain by having Russia harrass and threaten Germany.

A cloak of secrecy has surrounded American-Russo relations, thus to shroud the hand of Churchill directing America's international policies. Prime Minister Churchill has used America as a catspaw in the game of defending Britain, by inspiring Soviet Russia to occupy Germany's attention with threats in the Baltic and Balkan nations.

America has formulated her actions on the example of Great Britain's relations with Russia; but, as ridiculous and hypocritical as were Britain's actions, our own have been even more so.

Although Chamberlain attempted to justify Soviet Russia's conquest and occupation of Poland, President Roosevelt condemned the action as wanton aggression.

British statesmen maintained a prudent silence when Russia launched her attack against Finland, but President Roosevelt, in a letter to President Kalinin, condemned Russia's action.

The Russian government, furthermore, flaunted international law, and taunted America in the handling of the *City of Flint* incident.

Great Britain and the United States acted concertedly against Russia for her sovietization of the "Little Three" countries of the Baltic.

Acting, it would appear, on the advice of British diplomats, our State Department placed a "moral embargo" on the shipment of ore, oil, machinery and supplies to Russia; because at that time Britain feared that the supplies were transshipped to Germany.

America then reverses her previous stand when British and Soviet relations improve, and there has now been made what amounts to a secret tripartite understanding.

The report from foreign correspondents of this supposed agreement virtually coincided with this country's renewal of the American-Soviet trade agreement and Russia's ominous moves in the Balkans.

Now, America has launched upon a great business venture with Russia which demands the transfer of millions of dollars in gold.

* * *

The tripartite "agreement" with Russia, England and America, acting in co-operation and co-ordination with one another, is an accomplished fact.

Russia agrees to withhold supplies from Germany and Italy and to worry Germany by ominous moves along the Roumanian border.

England has agreed to continue to oppose Japanese conquest in China and to continue supplying arms and materials to the Chinese Nationalists

The British navy was withdrawn from Pacific waters, but America undertakes to use our Navy to preserve the *status quo* in the Far East

As long as Russia could be persuaded to worry Germany through ominous moves in the Baltic or Balkan countries, England could be reasonably sure that Germany would not dare to invade England with all her troops concentrated at the Channel ports and her borders undefended.

* * *

So America resumes trade with Soviet Russia.

All cargoes to Russia will be shipped via the Pacific ocean, whether the ships load in Atlantic or Pacific ports

The Russian ship which recently sailed from Hoboken for Vladivostok — with a portion of the dismantled Soviet building of the 1939 world's fair and with "Big Joe," the gigantic statue of a Soviet workman which surmounted the Soviet pavilion — was the first in the fleet of Soviet and Scandinavian ships engaged in the new Russo-American commerce.

For months, the dismantled Soviet building and exhibits of last year's fair had awaited return to Russia in a warehouse on the Hoboken waterfront. As soon as the Russo-American trade deal was negotiated, however, ships in the Russian trade began moving freely through the port of New York.

The United States State Department had known that Soviet Russia had been buying copper, molybdenum, lead and tin for Germany and making huge profits as purchasing agent But now, apparently, the United States will trust Soviet Russia's good faith not to re-sell the previous ores and materials

For a thorough understanding of America's international policies — and especially our relations with Soviet Russia — an American, it seems, must study British foreign policy

Well, Well!

WELL, WELL, Harry Bridges, the West Coast waterfront labor baron, is tied up with the Reds after all.

And who do you think discovered the connection?

Why, the good old radical *New York Post*, which is owned by George Backer who literally married into the Kuhn-Loeb banking firm.

Backer used to be a great booster of Bridges, back in the days when it was smart and New Dealish to be a Communist

Now that John L. Lewis has turned against President Roosevelt, papers like the *Post* are busy exposing the Reds — just as they used to be busy defending them.

So last week Backer's newspaper proved that Harry Bridges is a "Red" because he has started a fight against Station KYA at San Francisco for banning a daily broadcast written by Mike Quinn, a *Daily Worker* columnist.

Practically every honest newspaper has known and published the fact that Bridges was a Red, years ago.

But the *New York Post* waited until a week before election day to make its "discovery"

Comment

The Warship Bungle

AN ARTICLE by William LaVarre, entitled *"South of the Border,"* was inserted by the Hon. George Holden Tinkham of Massachusetts, in the *Congressional Record* (Sept. 25).

It concerns the bad trade this country has made with Great Britain in the matter of the 50 destroyers for certain "leases" of defense areas in the British possessions.

The sub-heading of the article reads:

"Uncle Sam, Tenant?—Merely Leasing Naval and Air Bases in the British West Indies, Without National Title, Will Bring Us Only Liabilities and International Headaches—Are We to Spend Millions Improving England's Long-Milked Caribbean Possessions and Providing Employment for Foreign Labor, Commerce for English Profits?"

The following thoughts are expressed in the article:

"Before he left London on his propaganda mission to the United States, Sir George Paish, former economic adviser to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, was told to stop talking about exchanging West Indian Islands for American planes, ships, and to promote instead the idea of merely leasing naval and air bases in the Caribbean to the United States for 99 years. A few weeks previous to his mission, Sir George had publicly proposed at a London dinner that some of England's possessions could be profitably swapped for American war materials, and thus circumvent the embargo of our *Johnson Act*.

" 'The danger of our not being able to command enough cash to buy what we need,' Sir George had said, 'is a matter of life and death. The time is more opportune than ever before for ceding some of the West Indian colonies. Surely out of this vast Empire of ours we can spare one or more of the West Indian Islands.'

"A number of Americans who heard this speech were amazed that Sir George, an Englishman of the old school, so wholeheartedly fell in with an American wish to secure United States Caribbean fortifications. On the other hand, many British folk who heard it thought the old diplomat had become too mellow with age. Neither the Americans nor the Englishmen knew that Sir George's motives were just as shrewd as usual.

"One of the most expert horse traders of the British Empire, Sir George had just finished reading a highly confidential report which had been delivered to the colonial office by England's Royal Commission Investigating Conditions in the British West Indies.

"The commission's report was so malodorous that it had been hastily locked up after Sir George looked at it, and has been seen by very few other people.

* * *

"The report of the Royal Commission Investigating Conditions in the British West Indies would be, however, of great interest now to our naval and military authorities and to United States Congressmen. It dissipates all glamor and romance about the West Indies in its first sentence. It tells things about Jamaica, Trinidad, Barbados, St. Lucia which no tourist booklet ever dared divulge.

"Studying the increasing strikes, riots, hunger marches, and 'down-arms-day' unrest, to which the Foreign Office had been deaf and blind as long as possible, the royal commissioners stated the following facts: A great part of the British West Indian population of 2½-million (natives) were only occasionally employed. The majority of the people were underfed. Housing conditions were deplorable, in the plantations as well as in the towns. Sanitation in 90 per cent of the area was described as 'nonexistent.' A large section of the population of each island suffered from malnutrition, especially the children. Infant mortality, due to lack of prenatal and infancy care, was increasing.

"The Royal Commissioners minced no words in blaming the West Indian disaster on Colonial Office policies which administered each island solely for the purpose of securing for England cheap tropical imports and selling high-priced English exports—and not for the economic benefit of the islands or their inhabitants. Planters had to export their crops at low prices to London and pay high prices for English imports. English banks loaned only for export crops which the Colonial Office wanted, sugar, cocoa, tobacco, and such annual crops as England could profitably use.

"They would not finance planters for the production of diversified crops which the people of the island needed or which could be sold outside the British Empire. The banks, at high interest rates, would finance high-priced purchases if made from English manufacturers, but not those which local importers might obtain at lower prices from non-English sources. The colonists were no better off in 1940 than the colonists of the eighteenth century had been.

"The commissioners charged several governors with incompetence; asked that the islands be immediately cleared of their increasing slums; that garden plots be provided for unemployed and poor families so they could grow their own food; that a free meal be provided each day for each child in each school, and that an immediate grant be sent to West Indian treasuries to finance the crisis of unemployment and social welware emergencies. An annual dole of at least £1-million ($5-million) was urgently advised.

* * *

"Sir George Paish, studying this disagreeable news at a moment when his charts showed him increasing English war costs, decided quickly that the time, to use his words, was 'more opportune than ever before' for ceding some of the West Indian colonies to the United States. But, just before sailing for America to unload two of the most unprofitable islands on the United States taxpayers, his advisers hit upon an idea that seemed to the House of Lords a much better proposal.

"Instead of getting rid of an impoverished island, why not lease a little section of it to a good tenant for a few years, let him do a lot of work, spend much money locally, increase jobs, payrolls, and local commerce, which would not only relieve the House of Lords from having to dig into already heavily taxed English estates in order to support the West Indies, but provide such a business boom for the West Indies that the islands might soon be producing a profit for England's Colonial Office.

"If the United States could be sold the idea of spending millions of dollars in payrolls, giving thousands of jobs to Jamaicans, Trinidadians, St. Lucians, and unemployed Barbados, and perhaps even providing immediate employment for the unemployed of British Guiana and Honduras, two birds could be killed with one stone—or rather, tenant. England's war debts would be canceled and England's future colonial losses underwritten and subsidized. In addition to this economic miracle, a mere tenant would build fine airports, marine bases, paved highways, and other property improvements, at no expense whatever to the Colonial Office.

"Thus from three directions at once has a campaign been launched upon us to secure our signature to 99-year leases for 18 naval and air bases in exchange for the cancellation of $4-billion worth of British 1918 war debts and 50 United States destroyers. Simultaneously with Sir George's personal appearances in the United States (and he had cleverly secured advance lecture engagements which, if not canceled, would take him from coast to coast) Viscount Halifax issued a statement in the House of Lords, from whose estates taxes otherwise would have to come to finance the West Indies, that such a leasing arrangement has already been agreed upon in principle by the American administration.

"If this is a fact, then the American people had better wake up or we who have already been drained by taxes to offset House of Lords debt defaults since 1918 will be committed, without any chance of public or congressional discussion, to assuming British West Indian liabilities which will drain us for another 99 years. We should find out just to whom Viscount Halifax refers as the party of the first part.

"Whom have we got, in London or elsewhere, who has committed or can commit the people of the United States to such an international liability? For us to assume the burden of investing in fortifying islands to which we will never have title, or providing payrolls for foreign labor rather than our own citizens, would be sheer stupidity. But it looks as though someone has promised to

(Continued on Page 12)

—Cartoonist Eubank in the New York Sun

The World Tomorrow

An editorial in the Chicago Tribune

THE BRITISH bombed the unused Reichstag building and other public buildings in Berlin. The Germans replied by dropping a bomb on Buckingham palace. The two nations at increasing tempo are hurrying to pound each other to pieces.

The result? Who knows? The battle to decide the fate of Europe is just warming up. It is what we have come to call total war.

It spares no one.

It might reduce Europe to a wilderness of destitution for a generation. Presently even peace will be only a lesser calamity.

In the world of tomorrow the United States may be the one reservoir in which western civilization has retained the essentials of recovery. That is a possibility.

It is not a certainty.

Comment

(Continued from Page 11)

do so, for Winston Churchill has also announced his official confidence that 'His Majesty's Government is well pleased to accord defense facilities to the United States on 99-year-lease bases. Undoubtedly,' he added, 'this process (of leasing) means that two great organizations of English-speaking democracies will be somewhat mixed up together in some of their affairs.'

" 'Somewhat mixed up,' is a masterful example of understatement. We would be so mixed up that, like the two families who tried to share the same apartment, we'd all end up quickly in the divorce court — or worse.

"It is incredible that we Americans could have been pledged, even in principle, to assuming all Caribbean defense costs without any title, for assuming additional liabilities without any tangible, practical assets. But Viscount Halifax and Winston Churchill, in London, say we have. Sir George Paish on this side of the Atlantic insists we have. And soon, from Nassau, England's new Governor General of the British West Indies, no less a salesman than England's former king-emperor, the Duke of Windsor, plans to issue a congratulatory proclamation. President Roosevelt, when asked to comment on the who, when, and why of this English optimism, also increases the mystery by answering enigmatically that excellent progress is being made but that he cannot go into details because the subject was too involved Too involved for whom?

"If there is going to be, through this leasing scheme, some preliminary form of 'union now' with England's liabilities, and we are going to be soon 'somewhat mixed up together,' it seems to me that we ought at least be allowed to argue the subject in passing. I think that, before any such commitment is made—to lease pieces of islands rather than invest in clear titles—we should have time to consider several facts: That the West Indies are not today in abject poverty is due to United States investments in developing the Panama Canal, which created new international trade routes that brought shipping lanes past the British doorsteps (and to which thousands of Jamaicans, Trinidadians, and Barbados rushed for employment). But, whereas Puerto Rico, to which we obtained title, does 94 per cent of its trade now with the United States, thereby helping to balance our investments in its Caribbean fortifications, the British West Indies send 85 per cent of their trade away from the United States.

' ' '

No matter how much we would invest in fortifying British island tips and bays, no matter how many millions of dollars we contributed to British West Indian labor prosperity, we would not increase our share of the British West Indian trade. Trinidad, for example, in spite of the large United States investments in asphalt, oil, and international air terminals, does only 5 per cent of its trade with the United States.

"Jamaica, from which the English chased the Spaniards in 1665, and which Englishmen made the center of their profitable Caribbean slave trade, is becoming volcanic with increasing labor unrest. There have been riots even in the British naval docks. If we merely leased tenant's quarters on Jamaica we would have no authority whatever to administer community assets so that the people of Jamaica would benefit. *The Colonial Office in London would benefit by every dollar the American Government spent.*

"The advantages of additional air and naval bases in the Caribbean are urgently evident but these should be established on totally United States administered islands, or internationally partitioned halves of islands, permanently ceded to us for value received Any actual step in the direction of joint occupancy where we are spending all the money and England is getting all the profit—and non-Americans all the new jobs and payrolls—is unthinkable until after all such proposals have been discussed by the American people and its constitutional authority—Congress.

"There is no doubt that, under war dictatorship, Winston Churchill, Viscount Halifax, and Sir George Paish's economic friends may well be able to decree what England and the British West Indies, and their people will do But there is still a great deal of difference in the theory of democracy as seen through English and American eyes. We have given, as yet, no authority to any man or any small clique of ministers, with or without portfolios, to sell out even paper assets or old warships for 99 years of increasing liabilities and international complications We can share the North American Continent with Canadians, ancestrally (for Canada is a dominion, not a colony), and we are good neighbors, and we each have clear title to our own property. But we can't share British West Indian islands successfully as tenants of London's often changeable but always self-centered Colonial Office.

Belated Justice

AN EVENT at the Belgian pavilion, in the last fortnight of the New York world's fair, was dramatic in its significance.

The bust of Leopold III, King of the Belgians, had been moved from its place of honor in the Belgian exhibit last Spring. It was put in a storeroom after Belgian officials who escaped the Nazi *blitzkrieg* had "deposed" their young monarch.

All Summer long, as visitors poured through the beautiful Belgian building, the king's pedestal stood empty.

But some days ago, Franz Van Cauwelaert, former Minister of State in Belgium, came to this country. As a result of what he told the Belgians in New York, *the statue of Leopold was returned to its former place.*

In a prepared address, delivered with what the *Boston Post* calls "the care and solicitude worthy of such a great question," M. Van Cauwelaert told some 700 Belgians and their friends that *a "misunderstanding" had caused the removal of the King's statue!*

"It has been proven," the Minister said, "that the Belgian army did not fail to accomplish its full duty and that our King did not accept the idea of complete capitulation."

Leopold is still King of the Belgians.

' ' '

"All this," comments the Boston editorial, "has happened between the snows of Europe. In the Spring he was a coward and an outcast and a betrayer of England. Now he is being gradually restored to his former glamour

"Behind those tightly guarded lines of the invasion coast lies the country of the Belgians, perennial battleground of Europe. Within its confines are the fields of Loos and Liege, Mons and Waterloo.

"Somewhere among his people is Leopold, thinking what thoughts no man can know, possibly, for a long time. He is a young King whose life saw two bitter blows, the loss of his Queen and his kingdom.

"His people around him must be very hard pressed by the war at present. The invasion destroyed what scanty crops the country raised The blockade forbids importation of food.

"The relief system of the German army is feeding the civilians and the concentration camps hold most of his soldiers

"History's pages are probably turning very slowly for the people and the monarch nowadays. But there seems to be a feeling that, out of the welter of war and a tissue of stories, the truth is finally being uncovered."

' ' '

Readers of SOCIAL JUSTICE will recall — we hope — that this magazine did not join in the popular cry of "traitor" hurled against the captured King who had fought to the last bullet and then surrendered to save the remnant of his battle forces.

We said then that, as the only information available showed, it was more likely true that the young king had been an heroic defender betrayed by those on whom his nation had reason to rely for support.

We still say that, having had no reason to retract our viewpoint.

And now, it seems, that the Belgians at the New York fair corrected their "misunderstanding" barely in time for the closing ceremonies

Will the American press give the publicity to this event that was accorded to the so-called "traitorous surrender?"

Don't be silly, of course it will not.

Soviet Friendship

THE RECENT amazing defense of Soviet Russia by Congressman Adolph J. Sabath of Illinois is bearing fruit for the Reds in Russia and their stooges in America.

It was October 1 when the New Deal chairman of the House Rules Committee told the House in effect that Communist Russia was just dandy and that the United States would be smart to play ball with our fine feathered Soviet friends

Why? To combat totalitarianism, of course.

Soviet Russia, you see, is a great "democracy" and as such would help us fight the ruthless dictators.

If you don't know that, write to Congressman Sabath. He'll be glad to tell you all about it

In reporting Mr. Sabath's plea for closer relations between the United States and Soviet Russia, SOCIAL JUSTICE raised the question of whether the speech was a "feeler" to be followed by some kind of Administration action

As events developed it became clear that the speech had been just that

On October 12 the Maritime Commission announced that it would permit the Soviet

(Continued on Page 13)

Comment

(Continued from Page 12)

to lease 100,000 tons of tankers for the transportation of oil from California to Vladivostok. At the same time Col. R. L. Maxwell, defense commission export control officer, said Russia might have $7-million worth of machine tools previously denied the Soviet.

This despite the fact that American defense needs require all the machine tools the nation can produce.

But that spirit of sacrifice cultivates and promotes friendly commercial relations with "friendly" Russia in a very real way.

Congressman Sabath had urged such action in the House less than two weeks before it was done.

* * *

And don't think the Reds fail to recognize a friend. After Chairman Sabath's pro-Communist oration, in which he whined that the Reds were "innocent victims of unfair smears" by Nazis and Fascists, the Communist organ *New Masses* went to work on Congress.

In letters to Senators and Representatives, Joseph North and A. B. Magil of *New Masses* asked the legislators how they stood on Sabath's "let's-get-chummy-with-Stalin" movement.

The communication stated that the *New Masses* editors also were writing a number of "publicists and churchmen."

Senator Bennett Champ Clark of Missouri, who received one of the letters, disclosed the matter in the Senate.

It was generally recognized as an effort by the official spokesman of the Communist Party to pressure Congressmen for more intimate Soviet-American relations.

"There is no doubt" said Senator Clark, "that the Communist Party is coming to life and is joining in the effort of our State Department to draw this country into an alliance with Soviet Russia."

At this writing Under-Secretary of State Sumner Welles and Soviet Ambassador Constantine Oumansky are still engaged in confabs expected to result in some Soviet-American "deal."

Loans Bear Interest

"SOME six or seven years ago a certain St. Louisan inaugurated a movement to feed starving Chinese in China by means of a Federal grant of reasonably large quantities of our surplus wheat against a long term substantial credit loan," writes "A.F.B." in the *Catholic Herald*.

"Enthusiastically backed by a number of Representatives and Senators, as a fine humanitarian proposal, *the plan was blocked by the Roosevelt administration* — that is, by Mr. Roosevelt and the Department of State.

"Consequently, the starving Chinese kept on starving until many thousands had died because Washington would not give or loan the Chinese government the food the people needed and which we had to spare and to waste.

"Now, when China is not asking for food, our administration is offering that country a loan of $25-million.

"Why," asks the *Herald*, "the one attitude then, and the other now?"

* * *

Perhaps, the simplest answer is that *loans bear interest*. There is no profit for the money lenders in feeding starving Chinese.

Perhaps, simple answers are best. The whole international picture is simple. As simple as this:

Corner all the world's gold in one control, then lend it out to those who do not have gold, taking a mortgage back on their countries to insure that unborn generations shall repay the loans with interest. Call this "democracy," if you will and build yourself a vast armament to defend it.

But, unfortunately for the success of this scheme, another set of powerful financial titans — operating without gold, on a basis of barter backed up by dictators and guns — challenges this gold-debt racket.

If those who have gold cannot and will not come to terms with the goldless dictators, then it only remains for one side to defeat the other.

That's simple, isn't it?

And understandable.

Man vs. the State

"THE DOCTRINE that America is through — except for big government — is not just a philosophy," says the *Pittsburgh Press*. "It's a vehicle that carries the nation which gets aboard straight toward autocracy.

"More and more people," the editorial points out, "depend upon the Government. More and more bureaucracy grows. Less and less the individual counts. That which previously was done by the individual is taken over by the State as more and more of the citizenry go to work for the Government. Every extension of bureaucracy implies increased power in the regulative agencies — power out of all proportion to the actual increase in the public machine. (There are now 1,023,341 persons on the Federal civil payroll as compared with 451,250 in 1933.)

" 'The transfer,' wrote Herbert Spencer, 'weakens the one and strengthens the other, in far greater degree than is implied by the relative change of numbers. A comparatively small body of officials, coherent, having common interests, and acting under central authority, has an immense advantage over an incoherent public which has no settled policy, and can be brought to act unitedly only under strong provocation.'

"Spencer didn't mention the New Deal because he was writing that in 1886. But he was talking about a trend that was not new then and is not new now. It is a trend that threads through all history and spells a constant struggle of the man versus the state. It travels always on that same vehicle.

"Make the people believe they're through. 'No more frontiers.' Make them think only papa can fix. Give 'em bread and circuses and charge the bill to posterity. That's the formula.

"Out of it have grown monarchs, kings, czars, emperors. And out of the philosophy, which finally flowers in some pot-bellied bourbon declaiming 'I am the State,' grows the counter philosophy of popular government; of the State as the servant not the master.

"The modern term is dictatorship and that tide has been running high. But it's the same old urge — from Alexander to Hitler.

"America is not immune."

Slandering the Dead

"WHEN a man dies, American custom requires that those who would have said ill of him in life should keep silent."

This is not only a respected maxim, but, word for word, is the lead sentence of an article directed against the late Senator Lundeen in a recent issue of the magazine, *Friday*.

Friday, of course, chose to disregard its own preaching and proceeded to accuse the former Senator from Minnesota of being a Nazi fellow traveler.

As everyone is aware, *Friday* itself is a fellow traveler of the Communist Party and was founded for the express purpose of presenting the Reds' new "peace" line.

Many on its staff, including the staff photographer, are card-bearing Communist Party members and it regularly buys and prints stories from professional Reds.

To prove that Senator Lundeen was "a Nazi," *Friday* shows a picture of him addressing a reception in honor of the Duke of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, who is a grandson of the late Queen Victoria of England.

Since this "evidence" is a bit dubious, the magazine clinches its argument with a statement that Boake Carter and Father Coughlin have both been ardent supporters of the late Senator Lundeen.

This logic is — Coughlin is "a Nazi," Carter is "a Nazi," they were both friends of Lundeen, therefore Lundeen was "a Nazi."

That's like saying a Chinese is a white man, a Chinese is a friend of a Japanese, therefore a Japanese is a white man.

This is the sort of "logic" that appeals to Reds — they even have a name for it: "dialectical materialism."

The dialectics, this time, started out from a piece of gossip carried in the Pearson-Allen newspaper column to the effect that Senator Lundeen was "being investigated by the F.B.I." at the time of his death.

This was specifically denied by the F.B.I. but *Friday* does not mention that.

Then reference was made to Boake Carter's defense of Lundeen after the Pearson-Allen smear, and to the fact that this defense was reprinted in SOCIAL JUSTICE.

Thus, all the pieces of the puzzle fitted together — at least to *Friday's* satisfaction.

Lundeen was "conclusively" proved to be a Nazi.

It is also interesting to note that Robert Allen of the Pearson-Allen duo that originated the smear is reliably reported in newspaper circles to have been a former Washington correspondent for the Communist *Daily Worker*.

But now, Allen and Moscow have parted ways.

Allen now fabricates for Britain and the New Deal. He leaves the duty of "lying for Moscow" to such periodical colleagues as the staff of *Friday*.

Comment

Censorship and Opinion

AN EXAMPLE of press and radio censorship which requires a public commentator to express opinions directly opposite to those he honestly holds has been disclosed by a recent incident in New York City.

Major Paul C. Raborg is a radio commentator on war news. Recently, before a Rotary Club luncheon at the Hotel Commodore, the commentator spoke his own views freely.

In a letter to a radio station, he wrote:

"As you know, in all my newspaper writings and radio speaking, *I am to a certain extent limited by paper and station policies.* In this speech I am going to 'pull no punches' but state my opinions exactly as to future happenings'."

Addressing the Rotarians, Major Raborg said:

"My personal opinions, both as to the second world war and the present position and armed condition of the United States, are contrary to many. So, in starting, I will define my own position.

"Under the present circumstances, I am definitely an isolationist. This has nothing to do with public opinion.

"In matters of this kind, I am equally definite that I believe the will of the majority should rule, and I cannot get away from my viewpoint of the *Monroe Doctrine.* What we demand, we should grant to others.

"However, my ideas are based on an unusual military, tactical, strategical, and war experience background, plus a night and day study of conditions that have led us to the present international situation. In reality, my conclusions are based entirely on a very cold-blooded military analysis.

"If our present national policies are pursued," the speaker warned, "we will be at war with Japan before January 1st, 1941!

"I feel equally positive that the empire of Great Britain will collapse before the end of the coming Winter, and that there is no help which we are capable of giving to her that can now save Great Britain

"I believe the present German attack on the British Isles is and has been a systematic sledge-hammer destruction of land, sea and air defenses. When this has been accomplished to a sufficient extent, I still think there will be an 'all out' air *blitzkrieg* to complete the destruction.

"If Hitler is successful, an oversea invasion will be launched, possibly several, and probably under cover of fog.

"In my opinion," the speaker concluded, "Germany and Italy, in their present offensives, are going through on schedule.

"Their delay, which most everyone in this country, through 'wishful thinking,' is heralding as failure, is in reality a warming up to and preparing for the all-inclusive *blitzkrieg* which, in the opinion of the four nations involved, will end the British Empire with one blow."

Destruction as an Industry

UNDER THE above caption an editorial in the *Wall Street Journal* views with alarm the rising tide of industrial activity devoted to war and destruction, and the editorial writer shrinks from the contemplation of the collapse that must come when the world, wrecked by a long war, suddenly returns to peace.

Says the *Wall Street Journal:*

"Most people are vaguely aware of the fact that war-making and preparation for war-making are now the world's major industry, but it comes with something of a shock to find that *materials essential to war constituted 42 per cent of this country's exports* during the twelve months ended with August, 1940.

"Imports of such things during the same time showed far the largest rate of gains of anything entering our ports. Moreover, it is clear that as far as we can see ahead the 'boom' in manufacturing and distribution which is already under way will have war as its predominant cause.

"Perhaps nothing could more simply and briefly describe the present state of the world than to say that it is devoting all its energies and resources to the construction of things *the only use for which is destruction of men and things.* It is not merely waste but waste to the nth power.

"Nothing like it was ever seen in man's experience prior to 1914 and the 1914 episode now seems to be no more than a preliminary stage of what was then a new and is now a giant industry.

"It is not surprising that men whose business or bent it is to look ahead and try to foresee the course of events are wondering in what state the world will find itself when some day the fighting stops, as stop it must. Perhaps here we have a possible clue to that absence of any apparent disposition to exploit the immediate prospects of rising business in stock speculation and investment, which has so long been a characteristic of the security markets."

Who Started It?

TUCKED AWAY obscurely in the *New York Herald Tribune* last week was a small news item that carried special significance — all the more so as it came from a British-controlled source

We reprint it *in toto:*

"Cairo, Egypt, Oct. 29 (AP). — Greek leaders in Egypt said tonight they had learned from home that the Greek Army had expected the Italian attack, and as a result had struck the first blow at the Italians at many places on the Albanian-Greek frontier.

"They added that the kilted, mountain-wise troops had pushed artillery through several valleys into Albania, and Greek planes had dropped pamphlets urging Albanians to revolt."

So who started the war, David or Goliath?

Anglophiles—and England

"THIS IS MY WAR," proudly declared Ambassador Isvolsky, who handled the money that corrupted the Parisian press and paid the assassins of Jaures; and he spoke for the aristocracy of Russia, says the *San Francisco Leader.*

It truly was their war until the Germans beat their armies into the dust and the outraged masses rose to scourge the plotters from the face of the earth. And a thorough job they made of it, a shambles beside which the French Revolution pales to insignificance.

The difference lay in the rise of the Bolsheviks to power, a regime more infamous by far than that of the Jacobins, and by far more lasting.

"Do we see in England today the prolog to a similar tragedy?" the *Leader* asks.

"All that can save her apparently is to make peace, and make it speedily. But she persists on her headlong way to destruction, and those in this land who cheer her on are really her worst enemies.

"Or so it must seem at least to one candid and judicious observer.

"Time may reveal the political mission that led the King and Queen of England—babes in the woods, puppets worked by wires in the hands of designing men—to Washington and Hyde Park as the fatal error of their careers. They may yet bewail in tears of anguish their White House visit as the initial step on a journey leading to another Ekaterinsberg slaughterhouse.

"Innocent victims, like the Czar and his family, of an accident of birth, they may yet be forced to drain the cup of desolation to its dregs, to mount the red pyre of sacrifice, while the real instigators of the conflagration now devouring Europe nurse their fat moneybags in secure retreats far from the raging tempest of fire and blood."

Inflation

SUPPOSE A FRIEND of hitherto modest means suddenly should show you a 40-room house he had just acquired, and two 16-cylinder cars, and a couple of roadsters, and then told you of having taken a winter home in Palm Beach and a hunting lodge in Canada. At first blush you'd think he was getting ahead, wouldn't you?

But then suppose it got noised about that all these possessions represented just a very small payment down, and that the rest was all owed for.

"There would," comments the *Pittsburgh Press,* "be some raising of the eyebrows, we think, and some talk about what happens to people who live beyond their means, and some predictions of a crash not far distant.

"That kind of story has been common enough in our generation—especially back in the 20's—so it's not hard to visualize. All of us, from personal experience, know all too well the dangers of buying more than we can pay for

"But it seems more difficult to grasp when the things acquired have been by the Government, and when billions are involved. So New Deal orators frequently get away with it when they go up and down the land pointing with pride at the innumerable and costly public structures which likewise have not been paid for. Yet the parallel is precise and the ultimate day of reckoning is as sure. The only difference is that the full extent of public credit is harder to gauge than is private credit, and in the case of the former there is the power to tax, whereas with the latter that power does not exist.

"But governments as well as individuals can go broke, as history amply shows. Having the power to tax, and *to coin money and fix the value thereof,* the governmental process of going broke usually takes the form of inflation—which is another word for repudiation.

"The savings of the people are thereby raided. The governmental books are balanced, all right. But it all comes out of the hides of the citizenry and is the most painful of all methods ever employed by sovereign governments seeking to perpetuate themselves and alibi their wastrel records of over-spending."

Comment

If the Constitution Goes, What Is Left?

IN TIMES of emergency, when our Government is undergoing a gradual change from democratic republicanism to dictatorial totalitarianism, Americans must look to their *Constitution*, the organic law of this Republic.

The power to declare war, and to end war, was assigned to Congress.

The power to formulate, enter into and ratify treaties and international agreements was granted to the President of the United States, but subject to the fundamental limitation that the President must exercise this power *by and with the consent of the United States Senate.*

The language of the *Constitution* is plain, the limitation explicit, and the basic law capable of only one interpretation.

The President has entered into agreements with Great Britain which even he has characterized as "epochal and far-reaching." The undertakings were negotiated in secret between Messrs. Roosevelt and Churchill, Lothian and Kennedy, the American State Department and the British Foreign Office.

The first of these agreements was negotiated in secret and announced only when it had been accepted between the persons concerned. It was consummated *without the "knowledge, advice or consent* of the Senate" in whom the *Constitution* placed the final decisive as well as discretionary power regarding treaties and agreements.

The agreement between the President of the United States and the British Prime Minister is momentous in its implications, for it calls for the joint military, naval and aerial action between the signatories for the defense of the British possessions in the North Atlantic and the Caribbean Sea.

* * *

Here are three paragraphs from the note handed to United States Secretary of State Cordell Hull by British Ambassador Lord Lothian (Philip Kerr):

"All the bases and facilities referred to in the preceding paragraphs will be leased to the United States for a period of ninety-nine years, free from all rent and charges other than such compensation to be mutually agreed on to be paid by the United States in order to compensate the owners of private property for loss by expropriation or damage arising out of the establishment of the bases and facilities in question.

"His Majesty's Government, in the leases to be agreed upon, will grant to the United States for the period of the leases all the rights, power, and authority within the bases leased, and within the limits of the territorial waters and air spaces adjacent to or in the vicinity of such bases, necessary to provide access to and defence of such bases, and appropriate provisions for their control.

"Without prejudice to the above-mentioned rights of the United States authorities and their jurisdiction within the leased areas, the adjustment and reconciliation between the jurisdiction of the authorities of the United States within these areas and the jurisdiction of the authorities of the territories in which these areas are situated, shall be determined by common agreement."

* * *

You will note that the British Ambassador makes an offer which stipulates that leases *will be made*, that questions of jurisdiction *will be determined*, and that payments of compensation to the British owners of property to be expropriated under the agreement *will be paid by the United States* on terms to be mutually agreed upon!

The United States had already turned over its fifty "obsolete" decommissioned destroyers, although the British part of the contract had not as yet been made.

* * *

In his formal acceptance of the offer made by Lord Lothian, Secretary of State Hull recites the substance of the terms and the consideration paid by the United States as a "binder" on the deal.

The action of the Secretary of State was specific evidence that, under British and American law, a contract for future action in concert and conjunction had been consummated by the highest officers of the Government of the United States and the Government of Great Britain.

The British have not transferred sovereignty over their possessions to the United States. For this reason alone the *Louisiana Purchase*, quoted as a precedent, is no precedent, as the President implied and as the Attorney General asserted.

Furthermore, there are many other facts about the *Louisiana Purchase* which make it an altogether different deal than the destroyer-naval bases deal. In fact, almost the only similarity between the *Louisiana Purchase* and the Roosevelt-Churchill agreement is that they both happened.

However, the Attorney General offered to Congress an expert legal opinion to justify the unprecedented arrangement.

Attorney General Jackson thus advised the Chief Executive:

"The President's power over foreign relations, while 'delicate, plenary and exclusive,' is not unlimited. Some negotiations involve commitment as to the future which would carry an obligation to exercise powers vested in the Congress.

"Such Presidential arrangements are, customarily, submitted for ratification by a two-thirds vote of the Senate before the future legislative power of the country is committed.

"However, the acquisitions which you are proposing to accept are without express or implied promises on the part of the United States to be performed in the future. The consideration, which we later discuss, is completed upon the transfer of the specific items.

"The Executive Agreement obtains an opportunity to establish naval and air bases for the protection of our coast line, but it imposes no obligation upon the Congress to appropriate money to improve the opportunity. *It is not necessary for the Senate to ratify an opportunity that entails no obligation.*" (The italics are our own.)

Now, there is no qualification in the *Constitution* that international agreements must be of a "continuing permanent character" in order to fall within its provisions and requirements so that they should be consummated "by and with the knowledge and consent of the Senate."

But the Attorney General appears to have missed the point. As is evident from the wording of the agreement, the undertaking is stable, permanent, continuing and unconditioned by time qualifications and restrictions.

* * *

Following up this first destroyer-foreign bases deal, the leaders of the United States entered into further negotiations for an *Anglo-Pan American agreement* and for a *British-Commonwealth of Nations-United States agreement.*

These agreements cover the protection of British possessions in the Atlantic and Pacific, and the extending of greater help to Britain by the gift of more destroyers, flying fortresses, loan of our fleet, and mutual defense of reciprocal interests.

Beyond the fact that treaties and agreements have placed us on the brink of actual involvement in war, the method of entering into and formulating these treaties has delivered a death blow to the *Constitution* and the American way of life in a so-called Republic.

Appropriation of unconstitutional power is "dictatorial" usurpation.

Must America fight for democracy against dictatorship by cashiering democracy in America and substituting for it dictatorship?

If democracy and democratic processes of government must be destroyed, to prepare for a war to save democracy; then, "democracy" has a fundamental weakness which is suicidal.

Sabath and Fifth Column

CONGRESSMAN Adolph J. Sabath of Illinois, who recently hung orchids on Communist Russia in a House plea for closer American relations with the godless Soviet, is the author of one of the most ridiculous and vicious bills ever presented in the House.

Ostensibly it is a measure to curb un-American and "fifth column" activities.

Obviously, it is a measure to jail anyone who criticizes members of Mr. Sabath's race.

Under terms of the bill, which has been referred to the House Judiciary Committee, *possession of the Holy Bible easily could be construed as a "fifth column" activity punishable by imprisonment for 21 years!*

Defining un-American and "fifth column" activities, the proposal includes "inciting to riot or inciting racial or religious prejudice."

Knowing Mr. Sabath's background and record, SOCIAL JUSTICE realizes that his conception of what constitutes "inciting to racial or religious prejudice" differs materially from that of many persons.

On the floor of the House he has shown himself to be intolerant of any criticism which reveals his co-racialists in an unfavorable light.

* * *

To get on with the bill—*section 2* provides that anyone who "willfully and deliberately, by spoken or written words, justifies or attempts to justify fifth column activities" (including the inciting of racial or religious prejudice) is subject to fine and imprisonment.

Thus, anyone who should undertake to explain the reason for, say anti-Semitism, could be sent to prison as a "fifth columnist."

Part "c" of *section 2* is where owners of the *Bible* might discover they are un-American and liable to spend many years in jail.

It provides that anyone who "prints, publishes, edits, issues, circulates, publicly displays, *or possesses any book*, paper, pamphlet, document, poster, or written or printed matter in any other form containing fifth column activities" (including the inciting of racial or religious prejudice) "shall upon conviction be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned for not more than twenty-one years, or both."

* * *

There is one redeeming feature about Sabath's preposterous measure. Were it to become law and were it to be enforced rigidly on all counts, Mr. Sabath and a majority of his fellow New Dealers would be among the first eligibles for prosecution.

Under *part 4 of section 1* "aiding or comforting any foreign government to the injury or detriment of the United States" is a fifth column activity subject to $5,000 fine and imprisonment for 21 years

Letters

(SOCIAL JUSTICE aims to make this page a free forum and readers' opinions are invited. Naturally, the views expressed are not always those of this magazine. We cannot guarantee that contributions sent to SOCIAL JUSTICE can be returned to the writers. Letters not signed with the writer's name and address cannot be considered, although the name will not necessarily be used. We reserve the right to publish all letters received unless contrary instruction is specifically given.)

He Knows the Cards!

TO THE EDITOR:

As a vendor of your paper and a Catholic, I would like to answer some of Father Coughlin's critics.

It has been said that he, as a priest, should not mix in politics.

I am sure that it is as unpleasant for Father Coughlin to touch on this subject as it is for him to realize that he is unjustly being branded a politician, but with these corrupt times, a reformer can do nothing else but touch the source of much of the evil which he desires to do away with.

Today when the Holy Father expresses fear that Father Coughlin's own country may enter the Second World War, it is comforting to realize that a foreseeing priest has been fighting this very thing for a number of years.

"Sing out with the voice that God gave you," said the good old Missionary priest. "Use the talents God gave you" says the modern preachers. Why then should Father Coughlin remain silent?

It has also been asked what good it will do. If you had only three months to live, would you not rather have the doctor tell you the truth than to keep it from you? You could make your will and put your house in order.

Others say that Father Coughlin is not a prophet. I would like to answer this way: I have never seen Father Coughlin and know little about him personally, but I believe that he never laid claim to being a prophet.

However, he is an analyst of the first order. And what is more, he is an honest analyst.

A subject which any person is keenly interested in (Father Coughlin's is help for the poor) should bring forward their best gifts of knowledge of the future results which will follow.

My own father was keenly interested in an innocent card game. Before the game was half over he could tell which side would win. He was no mind reader or prophet. He knew his subject, just as the good radio priest knows his and can foresee future results.

That his kindness in trying to prevent future ills is so criticized as to make this good Father appear as a conceited foreteller of events, is a careless attitude.

Detroit, Mich. —Mrs. B.N.

Rep. Case Explains

TO THE EDITOR:

I have received letters from two of my constituents whose opinions I value highly, and who are deeply hurt because they have the opinion from the names published in SOCIAL JUSTICE for September 30, that I favored the principle of conscription.

That is not correct. I opposed vigorously the principle of conscription and voted against passage of the draft bill. The confusion arises over a misunderstanding of my motive in voting for adoption of the conference report.

I approved the conference report, believing it was the best compromise that could be agreed upon. Passage had already been voted by the House and Senate, with my vote in definite opposition.

There was no prospect that the conferees would make conscription milder with longer deliberation. The House was on edge. Members had had a fist fight on the floor. Our opposition to the bill and to the whole principle of peace-time conscription had been recorded in speeches during debate and by our votes. Mr. Mundt and I voted to accept the conference report rather than send it back for further brawling.

I also opposed repeal of the *Neutrality Act* and have resisted the steps which I thought were getting us into a foreign war.

—Francis Case
Congressman representing
20th dist., South Dakota

Washington, D.C.

Prefers Teaching

TO THE EDITOR:

What is to become of the common people? All the newspapers are feeding them propaganda which they are swallowing eagerly. Even the American Legion, while here in Boston a few weeks ago at its convention, reversed its stand from strict neutrality to "furnishing aid short of war" or some such hypocrisy.

Will you publish in your paper again, what I once read there regarding what Churchill said *after* the World War. As well as I can recall it now, Churchill said to a New York newspaper publisher that if the Americans had kept out of the war, that England would have made a settlement with Germany the previous April, and saved herself thousands in men and money.

That was all the thanks that England gave us when we pulled her "back" away from the wall (one of her Generals, Haigg, I think, said they (England) were fighting with her back to the wall). It would be a salutary piece of news for thousands to learn of Churchill's summing-up of America's help, when we, 25 years ago, went to England's aid.

I have subscribed for SOCIAL JUSTICE from the first issuance of the paper, and I am glad to see that it is back to its original work of teaching the people as Americans. Patriotism is not confined to any religion, and a large part of your subscribers are not of the Catholic faith.

Winthrop, Mass. —A.M.B.

Jewish War Record

TO THE EDITOR:

I note in your issue of September 30th, 1940, in your letter column, a note signed with the initials J.J.D. in which the writer says the following:

"Where are our religious people?

"There are 5,000 crippled and disabled World War soldiers at the "home" in Milwaukee and one is a Jew. Where are the rest of the crippled Jews? What army did they fight in?"

I presume that you are also interested in facts and for that reason I am quoting the following from a radio address of Senator David I. Walsh of Massachusetts on August 31st, 1940, and printed in the *Congressional Record* of September 14th, 1940:

"The total number of Jews in the service during the World War is conservatively estimated from 200,000 to 225,000, which constituted more than 4 per cent of the armed forces of the United States, whereas proportionately the Jews in this country formed about 3 per cent of the total population.

"No less than 1,100 citations for valor awarded to men of Jewish faith are on record. The Congressional Medal of Honor, of which only 78 have been awarded to date, was conferred on 3 Jewish soldiers. The Distinguished Service Cross is worn by at least 150 American Jews and the Croix de Guerre by 174 Jews of the A.E.F."

—Jewish War Veteran

New York City

Never, We Hope

TO THE EDITOR:

Today your publication stands alone, the last bulwark of "free speech and the freedom of the press," daring to voice the truth which is so treacherously being withheld from us. How long before it, too, shall be silenced by command?

Los Angeles, Calif. —F.A.R.

Must We Fight for Liberty at Some Second Lexington?

TO THE EDITOR:

Because sometime in the days to come we are going to fight our second war of independence from British domination, I have been making a thorough study of the American Revolution, its causes, its struggle and its result.

I find no bond in our present situation that binds us to the Crown as strong as the tie the Colonies had to break in their cause for "liberty."

A great majority of the people at that time had come directly from the Mother Country or, at least, their parents had been born abroad.

Today, we are generations removed from the maternal yoke of parentage that gave the founders of our Republic their greatest obstacle.

I take courage in the fact that in the coming revolt we are shackled only by "gold" bracelets that are already tarnished and worn thin by economic jangling.

I know that somewhere in America today there are still men who are writing, thinking, studying—who are preparing the way for another Patrick Henry, Jefferson and Washington. All our great men did not live in the past. All our ideals of "liberty or death" are not a yesteryear.

The Tories, dusting their high noses with lace kerchiefs, branded the patriots with the word "rebel" until it came to mean something despised and dishonorable. But the "rebels," paying the taxes out of the toil of their knotty hands, ploughing the virgin earth rooted with undisturbed decades, hewing cabins out of great oaks, manning the clippers and building the town plots, searching out the wilderness and surveying the turnpikes that led to this country's great destiny —the West—were not alone without those whose pens scratched in flickering candlelight and whose college degrees and ancestral estates were turned to the cause of "representation and freedom."

The oratory of Patrick Henry, the pen of Thomas Jefferson were as important as the steed of Paul Revere.

* * *

We patriots today, remembering how our Colonial ancestors died at Bunker Hill, froze at Valley Forge, resent the way our hard-won independence has been handed back to the Crown on a gold platter through foreign entanglements and international money-lenders.

We do not believe ourselves to be traitors any more than Samuel Adams believed himself to be when he cried, "If this be treason, let it be treason." But, if to redeem America from the internationalists, to make our country once again "the sweet land of liberty," we must carry the stigma of "Fifth Columnist," we will bear it with the same spirit that led Patrick Henry to cry, "If this be treason, make the most of it."

I agree it does not present a pretty picture for the future, but when men become slack about their liberties and indifferent toward their ideals to the extent that they permit their leaders to sell out to foreign domination, they must eventually pay the bill.

Now that the veneer is wearing off, we see our future lies not in a military invasion by a Hitler, but in ridding ourselves of an international bondage in which we have been kept unsuspecting prisoners for over a hundred years.

When these shackles have been broken, when the money control has been taken out of the hands of "thirteen families" and returned to the United States Congress, when all military pacts with Britain have been abolished and replaced with trade treaties of the world; then again we patriots can raise our hearts as the venerable bell rings out the words inscribed around its base:

"Proclaim Liberty throughout all the land to all the inhabitants thereof."

Minneapolis, Minn. —M.D.

Letters

Unionist Protests

TO THE EDITOR:

I am a member in good standing of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union, and have been for 21 years.

Up until the New Deal came to power, all we ever heard at our meetings was long live Soviet Russia.

We were compelled and assessed $15 three different times which was sent to Russia. Our beloved comrade, Sidney Hillman who is our president and now Mr. Roosevelt's man Friday is now talking "democracy."

Then and during those years, comrade Hillman made several trips to Russia and upon his return he would tell us how wonderful it was in Russia. For fourteen long years before the New Deal our union was a hot bed, and its slogan was "Down with all democracies and long live Russia."

Today comrade Hillman is redder than ever. No one in the rank or file of the union has a chance to become an officer. They vote for officers like they do in Germany. They hold an election and the membership has two choices—he can vote *for* the candidate or *against* him. There never is any opposition.

That is the kind of "democracy" comrade Hillman and the entire staff of grafting officers believe in.

I will dare any one to say or deny that this is not the truth. The membership is afraid to talk and I don't blame them. We are under an iron heel rule just like in Germany or Russia.

We never know what they do with our money, and if you try and find out, you endanger your health.

Please print this for the good of the membership of our union and the American way. I am afraid to sign my name in case this letter was lost and did not reach you.

Chicago, Ill. —A.G.

A Convert Testifies

TO THE EDITOR:

Three years ago as I went through the list of periodicals in the reading room of our public library the words SOCIAL JUSTICE caught my eye. I was intrigued no end and as I opened its pages and began to drink deeply in the fount of truth that sprung from its daring pages, a new world was opened to me.

Since then I have read every copy issued and have seen that other persons, truth-starved as so many are, were also able to partake.

I have never forgotten the source of my conversion and it has been my self-appointed task for some time past to see that the library is supplied with copies as soon as I am able to obtain them.

I leave copies of SOCIAL JUSTICE in streetcars, busses, waiting rooms, hotels, etc., since under our present circumstances, this is the least I can do for our most worthy cause.

Louisville, Ky. —F.M.

A Tourist Priest Reports Europe's View of Us

TO THE EDITOR:

During my stay in Europe, I met with many nationalities, so it might prove interesting to readers of SOCIAL JUSTICE to know some of its details.

When people in Europe meet a United States citizen, and they discover that they can converse in their own tongue with him, they want usually to ask about conditions in America. Very soon, almost always, the conversation turns to President Roosevelt.

I met many Englishmen, but their thoughts centered about the fact that Roosevelt is the best man in the United States. Of course, if he wishes a third term, nobody can prevent it. "We know what we have in him, and if ever we get in war again, with Roosevelt as President, we can feel quite satisfied that he will help us as much as possible."

When I reminded them it may prove not quite as easy the next time to bring America in a European war since they were so much fooled at the last occasion, they usually remarked, "We put it over on them once, we will do it again."

The Americans cannot withstand our propaganda and the Yanks are easy goats.

The Scotch argued almost in like manner, while the Irish never cared to discuss Roosevelt; they were always proud of it, if they had a relative in the United States, as they seemed to consider America a kind of heaven on earth.

The Frenchmen, speaking about Roosevelt, would say, "C'est un bon homme" — that is one good man. He will never leave France in the lurch.

Italians told me Americans have the name of being great bluffers and your President is no exception.

The Germans and Austrians were agreed that Roosevelt is their most bitter enemy, and never fails when occasion offers to show that hatred.

In Belgium and Holland I spoke to people who, smiling sympathetically, said, "Yes, you have a President who can spend the country back to prosperity. Has he ever been in business? Did he ever make a success of it?"

One Belgian made a remark which I might mention here. "I was in the last war, and surely I met with one coward. He was an Englishman, and when we were all falling back, this gentleman was so much afraid and excited, that he had to have a special train to protect his precious person. He acted as if he was more important than the whole of Belgium. This Englishman was no other than Winston Churchill."

In order to be more complete, I must admit that in Holland and Belgium Hitler was hated like poison, and I found that one surely would pick up a quarrel if he said one good word about Hitler.

On my way across the Atlantic, one of the first news items published told me about the treaty between Germany and Russia. No wonder that I returned to the United States with the firm conviction that if at all in his power, Roosevelt would find a way to get re-elected, for he considers himself qualified to be President in the circumstances.

—Catholic Priest

Lecompte, La.

Are These Our Chestnuts?

—Cartoonist Fitzpatrick in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch

Fair Play and Justice

TO THE EDITOR:

I have read SOCIAL JUSTICE since it was published and heard Father Coughlin in all his discourses, and up to the present time of writing, never heard a remark in any discourse that could be construed as hatred, un-American or un-Christian.

But to the contrary, if all of his listeners lived the lives Father Coughlin advocates, they would all be good, clean-cut Christian Americans.

Father Coughlin is well-educated, a wonderful speaker, a true American and a Catholic priest.

His discourses are clear, concise, brief, and to the point. Irrespective of who or where it hits, or whom it hurts. That is why some do not like Father Coughlin; he tells them the truth, and sometimes the truth hurts. But that is no fault of Father Coughlin's.

He still is the same grand speaker who won millions of hearts, and would have, I believe, as large a radio audience as any speaker on the air.

If Father Coughlin spoke over the radio like some of the other speakers I heard, God knows what they would brand him.

Let us take for example, some of the speakers we hear for Great Britain.

America must help Great Britain beat Hitler, irrespective of what it costs us Americans. Why?

I would like to see Father Coughlin speak over the network like Robert E. Sherwood did over WMCA. His topic was "Federal Union Now."

You can hear Naziism, Communism, Britishism, they are not controversial, but what about a man advocating Americanism—is that controversial?

Father Coughlin spoke of our *Constitution*, as a masterpiece. He never referred to it as a "scrap of paper," or as a something that was outmoded and antiquated. But as a document we Americans should be proud of, a document second only to the Ten Commandments of God.

If we still have a clean, fair and just democracy here, Father Coughlin will and can be heard again on the air.

One who believes in American fair play and justice.

Beaver Dam, Wis. —A.H.S.

A Silent Hour?

TO THE EDITOR:

The time has come for readers of SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine and the past listeners on the radio of Father Coughlin's addresses to do something about the cancelling of Father's talks.

I for one, and I know there are millions more of Father's friends, that would do something about it if they would make up their minds to do it, we should turn off our radios and not listen to any of those comics that are on during his hour, and not buy any of the articles that are advertised by those speakers, only what is necessary. That might be one way of getting even with the men that are so powerful in radio and advertising.

How about it, neighbors and friends all over the United States who would stand by Father Coughlin?

Detroit, Mich. —Mrs. W.M.

KNOW YOUR COUNTRY!

AND WIN YOUR SHARE OF THOUSANDS IN CASH PRIZES

QUESTIONS FOR THIS WEEK

QUESTION No. 11

Who Was the "Boy Orator of the Platte"?

1. Robert Ingersoll.
2. Bourke Cochran.
3. Henry W. Grady.
4. William Jennings Bryan.
5. Samuel J. Tilden.
6. Henry Clay.
7. Daniel Webster.
8. John C. Calhoun.

QUESTION No. 12

Which President of the United States Served Two Presidential Terms Not Immediately Succeeding Each Other?

1. John Quincy Adams.
2. James Madison.
3. William Henry Harrison.
4. James K. Polk.
5. Grover Cleveland.
6. Theodore Roosevelt.
7. Woodrow Wilson.
8. Calvin Coolidge.

Fill in This Coupon and Mail With 10 Cents in Coin

Make your selection by number from suggestions under each question. Write clearly the number in the little square.

No. 11 For Question No. 11 I select Answer No. ☐ **No. 12** For Question No. 12 I select Answer No. ☐

Name _____

Address _____

Town or City _____ *State* _____

EXTRA COUPON FOR SELF OR FRIEND

Fill in This Coupon and Mail With 10 Cents in Coin

Make your selection by number from suggestions under each question. Write clearly the number in the little square.

No. 11 For Question No. 11 I select Answer No. ☐ **No.12** For Question No. 12 I select Answer No. ☐

Name _____

Address _____

Town or City _____ *State* _____

Rules of the Contest

1. The *"AMERICA FIRST" Contest* is open to all readers of SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine, except employes or members of their families.

2. The contest shall consist of 50 questions on the history of the United States and the *Constitution* of the United States and shall run for 11 consecutive weeks beginning the week of October 7. Two questions each week for 10 weeks and all 50 questions on the 11th week.

3. A Grand Prize of $1,500.00 will be awarded the contestant returning the best or most appropriate answers to the 50 questions and otherwise complying with the rules. Contestants submitting the next most nearly correct answers and otherwise complying with the rules shall be eligible for the additional prizes in the order of their correctness.

4. In order to qualify as a prize-winner, the contestant is required to send in 10 cents in coin (not stamps) with each pair of answers, or a total of $2.50 with the 50 answers. For these remittances the contestant will be sent without further cost a handsomely illuminated copy of the *Constitution* suitable for wall decoration.

5. We cannot take into account solutions without signed names and addresses. Neither can claims to their ownership be recognized. We cannot be responsible for coupons arriving unduly late or lost in the mails. By entering the contest the contestant agrees to accept as final the decisions of the judges as to procedure and final outcome.

6. In event of ties, additional questions will be submitted. In event of final ties, after two such submissions, duplicate prizes will be awarded.

7. Do not decorate coupons. Neatness will not count.

8. Any inquiry, the reply to which could not affect outcome of the contest, will be acknowledged.

9. A contestant may send in any number of sets of duly qualified answers and each set will be judged as a unit, but no individual may win more than one prize. If submitting more than one set of answers, the contestant is required to keep them distinct by designating them "Set 1," "Set 2," "Set 3," etc. Each submitted set shall entitle the contestant to the illuminated copy of the *Constitution* referred to in Rule 4.

How well do you know the history of your country and its fundamental written law, the Constitution of the United States?

These days it is the duty of every citizen to be well-versed in the story of America's founding and its growth. With sinister forces seeking to undermine our institutions and liberty, every man, woman and child in the land should KNOW that great document which serves to preserve those liberties — the Constitution.

As a contestant in our great "AMERICA FIRST" Contest, you are learning the history of your country; you are gaining a knowledge of the Constitution; and you are striking for your share of thousands of dollars soon to be paid in cash prizes to 260 readers.

A Grand Prize of $1,500.00 CAN be yours as easily as that of any other contestant.

A Second Prize of $800.00; a Third Prize of $500.00; a Fourth Prize of $300.00; and 256 additional cash awards!

You can land squarely in the middle of the "big money" in this Contest by answering better than your competitors 50 easy questions on history and the Constitution.

Now, pay attention to this:

JUST AS SOON AS YOUR ENTRY REACHES OUR OFFICES YOU WILL BE RUSHED A HANDSOME, ILLUMINATED COPY OF THE CONSTITUTION, SUITABLE FOR WALL DECORATION.

You will have time to read and study the Constitution before the last 30 questions of the Contest, based upon it, are put to you:

Therefore, enter today by using the "Past Questions" Coupon at the bottom of this page.

Fill in that coupon. Mail it today. Within a few days you will have sent to you all questions which have appeared in the Contest right down to date.

Then you can answer these early contest questions; send your answers back with your remittance — and you're in.

Isn't that the smart thing to do — right now?

260 Cash Prizes to 260 Readers

GRAND PRIZE	**$1,500.00**
Second Prize	**800.00**
Third Prize	**500.00**
Fourth Prize	**300.00**
Fifth Prize	**200.00**
Sixth Prize	**100.00**
Seventh Prize, four cash awards of $25 each	**100.00**
Fifty prizes of $10.00 each	**500.00**
Two hundred prizes of $5.00 each	**1,000.00**
TOTAL	**$5,000.00**

USE THIS COUPON RIGHT NOW

SOCIAL JUSTICE,
Royal Oak, Michigan.

I wish to participate in the "AMERICA FIRST" contest.

Please send me immediately all past questions that have appeared in the contest since the beginning.

My Name Is _____

My Address Is _____

City or Town _____ State _____

FILL IN AND MAIL TODAY

A Letter to 'Social Justice'

In the editor's voluminous mail, directed to the Letters page, we received the following remarkable tribute to a free press. Believing that it deserves this fuller treatment we reproduce it here.

The people no longer accept the opinions furnished them cut and dried by the newspapers, because they know they are not free opinions.

They no longer accept the *dicta* of the press, because they know full well that publishers and editors have exchanged the ermine of the judicial bench for the wig of the advocate.

People are not like sticks and stones, *sans* eyes, *sans* ears, *sans* sense. They are fully aware that their newspapers are not impartial tribunals, but organs of partisan prejudice, advocates employed to promote special interests.

And, yet, this press is the "sentinel watch-tower of our liberty," the dynamics of Americanism! This is the press that presumes to criticize priests and powers, principles and politics; that opposes to the death every innovation until it is accomplished, then, if it prove popular, calmly takes to itself the credit and hurls foul scorn at all dissenters.

This is the press before which brave men are mute and honest men, fearing unmerited dishonor, keep silent!

And yet the anger of the press amounts to nothing more than a thunderous report and the stench of sulphur.

Men have defied it and lived — lived beyond prison walls, loved and respected. So, don't falter, keep on crusading!

* * *

It may be that under existing social conditions it is impossible that the press should be better than it is. No publisher can be blamed for declining to steer his newspaper into inevitable bankruptcy. It may be that the press has but adapted itself to social conditions which it did not make and is powerless to alter.

But while this fact — if it is a fact — may extenuate its frivolity, it does not excuse its offensive self-righteousness, its arrant hypocrisy, its attempt to shackle every man who, like Father Coughlin, would make social conditions better, or politics purer.

If it find it impossible to lead; if it find it necessary to servilely follow, to become a foul pander to partisan prejudice, a pleader of special causes instead of the umpire of national policy, then it should drop its high pretensions.

* * *

Let us hope that American journalism has reached its *nadir*, and that in the near future its tendency will be steadily upward. There are indications that proclaim it cannot go much lower. Public opinion is already turning upon it angry scornful glances.

Already may be observed an occasional effort to rise higher; already the truth is sometimes blurted out with a sullen defiance of party platforms, practices and policies; with a contempt of partisan prejudice, here and there an editor whose hand is not guided by the will of a *peon*, whose proud spirit is turning fiercely at bay.

Here and there is being planted the banner of Social Justice a little higher up the mountainside, and from its shelter rings sharp and clear, above the blah-blah of the barristers and stale platitudes of partisan polemics, a clarion call inciting the servile press to exchange the shackles for the sword— to stand erect in all its might and majesty, and lead where honest men dare follow.

* * *

Of course there are exceptions to the rule; there are to most rules.

There is occasionally a paper that publishes the honest convictions of an honest editor.

There is occasionally a paper that does not wait until the popular verdict is signed, sealed and delivered before daring to express an opinion; that panders to the prejudice of no party *clique*, class or narrow creed.

Such is SOCIAL JUSTICE. To whom all honor; may the tribe increase!

They are the noblest work of human hands — and the rarest.

NATIONAL WEEKLY

Social Justice

Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

After the War —Chaos

WHETHER or not Europe will become a continent of united states following the World War appears to be debatable in the minds of some Americans.

Whether or not the totalitarian forces in Europe will overwhelm their enemies likewise appears to be debatable.

No matter which side of the argument you adopt, the main question still concerns the United States of America.

What will happen to the United States of America following the war?

To answer that question let us set down a few well-known premises on which we can base our conclusion:

(1) In the war or out of the war as our politicians care to describe us, we are about to spend many billions of dollars for war equipment—possibly $75-billion, if the war lasts three to four years.

This equipment will be used for the advertised purpose of defending the United States and for the real purpose of protecting the remnants of the British Empire and its economic system.

(2) This huge expenditure in America will give employment to millions of unemployed and steady employment to millions of part-time workers.

(3) As in every war, new mechanical devices will be invented to speed up production and eliminate labor.

(4) At length, the war will come to a close. This means that the factories will cease producing war equipment. This means that millions of unemployed will be jobless, seeking support from the Government.

(5) Because the national debt will have been increased by some $75-billion, Government will be forced to impose $75-billion and more taxation upon the citizens.

(6) With millions unemployed; with millions living upon Government dole, the taxation which will be at least doubled what it is now, will be unbearable.

(7) As a result the only outcome of this war for the United States of America—under its present policies—is bankruptcy, economic chaos, and the abandonment of our method of living.

* * *

They who think that things are topsy-turvy at present have seen nothing.

Definitely, the worst is yet to come.

"*If war, all may be lost,*" Pius XII warned.

Following the war, a period of deflation will encompass us resulting in prices being knocked down to new low levels.

Following the period of deflation, Government will either repudiate its debts or have recourse to a wild inflation, pegging the dollar at a 35-cent purchasing power, or thereabouts, to enable taxpayers in 1946 to meet the debts contracted with normal dollars in 1940-41.

All that is an economic certainty—not a prediction.

Socially, it is doubtful if, within the next two generations, the American citizens will recapture the liberties and rights which they are beginning to sacrifice by pursuing a war of hate—a war which nobody will win and which everybody will lose.

* * *

The *Constitution* will have become ancient history.

Both Congress and the Supreme Court will have become subservient branches of Government under the dictatorship of a strong army man.

Political parties will be liquidated, one dictatorial party claiming all right to survive.

Freedom of press, of speech and of education will be restricted.

Nationalization of industry, of transportation and of communications will be the order of the day.

Although the above assertions appear to be the product of gloom, they are nothing more than the ugly realities which we need not prevision if we simulate the ostrich and keep our heads buried in the sands of ignorance.

All the irresponsible talk about America being invaded by Hitler has stirred up a spirit of war and destruction in America.

Neither Hitler nor any other foreign dictator will have need of invading America four years hence.

The principles and policies which we have adopted will accomplish the work in favor of chaos more expeditiously and surely than could be accomplished by 10-million foreign troops.

The pity of it is that all the frightful things in store for us could have been avoided had Woodrow Wilson, Clemenceau, David Lloyd George, Orlando, and their contemporaries, who conceived the *Peace Treaty of Versailles*, acted differently.

The whole disaster could have been avoided had the international financialists been put in their place ten years ago, instead of permitting them to impose their dictatorship of gold economy upon the world.

Who Lost the Presidential Election?

Ten Years Hence—See Page 3 Comment